COLLECTION OF PURITAN AND
ENGLISH THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE

LIBRARY OF THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

Division
Section
No.

SCC
9288
c. 2

W. H. Clarke. Edward Chigwell

THE

Morning-Exercise

Mr Joseph AGAINST Sanderson

POPERY.

OR, THE

PRINCIPAL ERRORS OF THE CHURCH of ROME

Detected and Confuted,

IN A

MORNING-LECTURE

Preached lately in *SOUTHWARK*:

By Several Ministers of the Gospel in or near LONDON.

Nathaniel Vincent

To the law, and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them. Isa. 8. 20.

Ἡ θεόπνευς ὑμῖν διατησάτω γρα ἡ ἐν παῤ οἷς ἂν ευρεθῆ τὰ δόγματα συνῳδὰ τοῖς θεί ις λόγοις ἐπι τυτοις ἕξει πάντως τῆς ἀληθειας ἡ ψήφ. Basilius in Ep. ad Eustathium Medicum.

Utile est libros plures a pluribus fieri, diverso stylo non diversa fide, etiam de quæstionibus iisdem; ut ad plurimos; ad alios sic; ad alios autem sic; res ipsa perveniat. Augustinus de Trinitate, lib. 1. cap. 3.

LONDON,
Printed by *A. Maxwell* for *Tho: Parkhurst*, at the Bible and three Crowns in *Cheapside* near *Mercers-Chappel*, and at the Bible within the Gate on *London-Bridg.* 1675.

POPERY.

To the READER.

THOSE Famous Ministers of Christ, *Luther*, *Melanchthon*, *Calvin*, *Zuinglius*, *Bucer*, and the rest of them, who justly are stiled Reformers of Religion; did say more against Popery, than any of the Papists have yet been able to give a solid Answer to: And indeed it was by wise and unintereſted men judged, above a hundred years ago, a desperate Cause, being so much against both Scripture and right Reason. The Church of *Rome*, therefore, that it might uphold and defend it self, hath had recourse unto *Cruelty*, *Policy*, *Sophistry*.

As for their *Cruelty*, What place almost is there that rings not of it? The *Massacre at Paris*, the *Irish Rebellion*, the *Gunpowder-Treason*, those *Flames* in which so many were burned in the *Persecution under Q. Mary*; do plainly shew, That the *Romish Beast* is the most *Cruel one* that ever was, and is extreamly eager to tear in pieces all that refuse to worship him. Those many thousands of Men, Women, and Children, who have been most barbarously butchered by Bloody Papists in *France*, in *Ireland*, in *Bohemia*, in *Piedmont*, in *England*; may inform all, what Arguments they use to promote their Religion, when once they have any Power in their hands; and what kind of dealing is to be expected where *Popery* shall prevail; unless there be a subjecting of *Bodies*, *Estate*, *Reason*, *Sense*, *Faith*, and *Conscience* also, unto their *Tyranny* and *Usurpation*.

And lest these Instances of Cruelty which I have mentioned, should be extenuated, as making nothing against *Popery*, because several of that Religion have condemned them; it will not be amiss to add, That *Thuanus*, an Historian of their own, gives this information; That the Pope when he heard of the Massacre, from his Legate at *Paris*, read the Letter in the Consistory of Cardinals, and *solemnly gave thanks to Almighty God for so great a blessing conferred upon the* Roman *See and the Christian World*. It was also decreed, That a *Jubilee* should be published; the Causes whereof, were to *return thanks to*

Historiarum lib. 53. *p.* 1604, 1605, *&c.* Nuncio de tumultu Parisiensi allato, mirum quantâ lætitiâ Romæ exultarum est. Lectis in Cardinalium Senatu Pontificii Legati literis decretum est, ut inde rectâ Pontifex cum Cardinalibus ad B. *Marci* concederet, & D. O. M. pro tanto beneficio Sedi Romanæ, orbiq; Christiano collato, gratias ritu solenni ageret: *& lege quæ sequuntur.*

God for destroying in France *the Enemies of the Truth and of the Church*, &c. Soon after, the Pope sent Cardinal *Ursin* in his Name to congratulate the King of *France*, who in his journey through the Cities highly commended the Faith of those Citizens who had an hand in the Massacre, and *distributed his Holiness's blessings among them.* And at *Paris*, being to perswade the reception of the Council of *Trent*, endeavoured it with this Argument, *That the memory of the late Action to be magnified in all Ages, as conducing to the glory of God, and the dignity of the holy Roman Church, might be, as it were, sealed by the approbation of the Holy Synod.*

If this Massacre be thus justified, commended, magnified, where there was also so much Treachery (for the *Protestants* were invited to a Marriage between the Houses of *Valois* and *Bourbon*; and then in the dead of the night * many thousands of them, without distinction of Age or Sex, were butchered, so that the Channels ran down with blood into the River); sure we may conclude, That the most horrid Murthers will be defended, as long as that which they call the *Catholick Religion* is thereby promoted. I grant indeed, there are some good-natur'd *Papists* which say, They dislike such bloody doings, whatever may be pretended for their justification: But 'tis more than probable, that these very Gentlemen, supposing the *Pope* had full Power to weild both Swords, if they should dare to talk against his Cruelty, would presently be *call'd*, and feel the stroke of his Swords, as *Hereticks*.

*The number of persons slain in this Massacre at *Paris*, and other places, amounted unto Thirty thousand.

Policy is another prop of *Popery*. By Policy I do not mean that Prudence in managing of State-affairs, which is joined with Integrity, Justice, Honesty; but that Craftiness and Subtilty, where no regard is had either to Truth or Conscience; but any thing is done, though never so much against the Rules of Righteousness, that carnal Ends may be brought about. The Pope having arrogated such Power to himself, that he can absolve Subjects from their Oaths of Allegiance, can take off the obligation of Covenants and Promises, and give Dispensations to transgress the Laws of God; hereby a door is opened to all Unrighteousness, and *Papists* may be allowed to dissemble, to lye, to be perjured, as long as 'tis for the *Catholick Cause*. The Writings of *Machiavel* have been studied more throughly by many of the *Romanists*, than the Scriptures of the Apostles

and

and Prophets. And thoſe who have converſed with the *Jeſuits*, and underſtand the Myſtery of *Jeſuitiſm*, find them ſuch exact *Achitophels*, that they will counſel to any thing, though never ſo ungodly, if it tend to the upholding of their Faction.

Laſtly, For their *Sophiſtry*: In this reſpect their Schoolmen, who have endeavored to argue for *Popery*, are famous. But when what they ſay is duly weighed, it appears to be but Sophiſtry, and no more. In the main points of Controverſie between the Church of *Rome* and us, their Arguments are anſwered in theſe enſuing Sermons; the truth alſo is confirmed by Scripture and Reaſon, and then an Improvement made in order unto practice. This mixture of Polemical and Practical Divinity together, 'tis hoped will be very uſeful.

The Miniſters who preached theſe Lectures, endeavoured to accommodate themſelves to the capacity even of ordinary Hearers: For the common people, conſidering the Induſtry of *Romiſh* Emiſſaries, are in great danger of being ſeduced; and this Book, through the bleſſing of God, may be an Antidote. I could have wiſhed that the Sermons had been delivered to me all together, that they might have been printed in better order, and ſorted together according to the ſubject-matter of them. But if the *Reader* pleaſe to conſult the Table at the beginning, he may read them in order if he be ſo minded.

To conclude: Since *England* was formerly ſuch a Tributary to the See of *Rome*, and ſuch vaſt ſums of Money were carried yearly from Hence Thither; we are not to doubt but the Pope looks upon us with grief that he has loſt us, and with an earneſt deſire to regain us. His Inſtruments are more than ordinarily buſie to this End, inſomuch that *both King and Parliament have taken publick notice of it.* This Lecture therefore againſt *Popery*, is very ſeaſonable; and if (which I earneſtly beg) this Labour be made ſucceſful to reduce any of them who have been ſeduced, or to arm and defend the people againſt one of the *greateſt viſible Enemies* that Chriſt has in the world; I ſhall exceedingly rejoice that my Pulpit was ſo much honoured by my Fathers and Brethren when they preached in it, and that ever ſuch a Project againſt *Popery* came into my mind.

NATHANAEL VINCENT.

The Theſes or Truths maintained in theſe Sermons againſt the *PAPISTS*.

I. *THE Scripture was written for the uſe of the Laity, and ſhould be tranſlated into known Tongues, that they may underſtand it; and ſhould be heard and read by them.* Text, 1 *Theſ.* 5. 27. Serm. 5. p. 105.

II. *The Scripture is a ſufficient Rule of Chriſtian Faith, or Record of all neceſſary Chriſtian Doctrines, without any ſupplement of unwritten Tradition, as containing any neceſſary matter of Faith; and is thus far ſufficient for the deciſion of Controverſies.* Text, 2 *Theſ.* 2. 15. Serm. 6. p. 149.

III. *The Teſtimony of the Church is not the only nor the chief reaſon of our believing the Scripture to be the Word of God.* Text, *Luke* 16. 29. Serm. 10. p. 313.

IV. *There is no External, Supream, and Infallible Judg in the Church of God, to whom all Chriſtians are obliged to ſubmit their Faith and Conſcience in all matters of Religion.* Text, *Mat.* 23. 8, 9, 10. Serm. 1. p. 1.

V. *There is no ſuch Church inſtituted by Chriſt, as all Chriſtians joined to one meer Human Head, either Perſonal or Collective: But Chriſt is the only Univerſal Head.* Text, 1 *Cor.* 12. 27, 28. Serm. 2. p. 25.

VI. *Kings and Emperors are not rightful Subjects to the Pope; neither hath he Power, for pretended or real Hereſie, to excommunicate and depoſe them, nor to abſolve their Subjects from their Oaths of Allegiance; but even the Clergy are ſubject to ſecular Princes, and their Bodies and Eſtates under their Government.* Text, *Acts* 26. 2. Serm. 3. p. 44.

VII. *The Pope of* Rome *is That Antichriſt, and Man of Sin, ſpoken of in the* Apocalyps, *and by the Apoſtle* Paul. Text, 2 *Theſ.* 2. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10. Serm. 4. p. 80.

VIII. *The* Proteſtants *did upon juſt grounds ſeparate from the Church of* Rome. Text, *Luk.* 6. 22. Serm. 14. p. 492.

IX. *The Lord Jeſus, who is the only Foundation of his Church, is the preſerver of its Duration, in ſome meaſure, viſibly throughout all ages.* Text, *Mat.* 16. 18. Ser. 25. p. 839.

X. *The* Papiſts *dangerouſly corrupt holy Worſhip, by their ſinful Prayers to Saints and Angels.* Text, *Rom.* 10. 14. Ser. 15. p. 519.

XII. *Pur-*

XI. *Purgatory is a groundleſs and a dangerous Doctrine.* Text, 1 *Cor.* 3. 15. Serm. 24. p. 813.

XII. *No Sin is in its own nature Venial, but every Sin is deadly, and deſerves eternal Damnation.* Text, *Rom.* 6. 23. Serm. 8. p. 261.

XIII. *The Good Works of believers are not meritorious of eternal Salvation.* Text, *Pſal.* 62. 12. Serm. 11. pag. 401.

XIV. *There are not any works of* Supererogation. Text, *Luke* 17. 10. Serm. 16. p. 548.

XV. *The Doctrine of Juſtification is dangerouſly corrupted in the* Roman *Church.* Text, *Rom.* 3. 24. Serm. 12. p. 441.

XVI. *'Tis not lawful to make Images of God, nor to worſhip him as repreſented by an Image; nor to direct our worſhip to an Image as a* Medium; *nor ſcandalouſly to ſeem to worſhip Images, by doing it corporally as Idolaters do, though we pretend to keep our hearts to God. And the* Papiſts *preſumptuouſly leave the ſecond Commandment out of the Decalogue.* Text, *Mat.* 4. 10. Serm. 13. p. 458.

XVII. *Publick Prayer ought not to be made in an unknown Tongue.* Text, 1 *Cor.* 14. 15. Serm. 9. p. 295.

XVIII. *The Pope and his* Clergy, *by falſe preſumptuous Pardons and Indulgences, have heinouſly injured Chriſt, the Church, and Souls of men.* Text, *Heb.* 10. 14. Serm. 19. p. 677.

XIX. *That Doctrine in the Church of* Rome *which forbids to marry, is a wicked Doctrine.* Text, 1 *Tim.* 4. 2. Serm. 17. p. 578.

XX. *The* Papal *Doctrine in denying the poſſibility of Aſſurance, is falſe, and hath a dangerous tendency to deſtroy the true Peace and Comfort of ſouls in the certain hopes of everlaſting happineſs.* Text, 2 *Pet.* 1. 10. Serm. 18. p. 617.

XXI. *Baptiſm and the Lords Supper are the only* Sacraments *of the Covenant of Grace under the New Teſtament.* Text, *Prov.* 30. 6. Serm. 20. 701.

XXII. *There is no ſuch thing as* Tranſubſtantiation *in the Euchariſt; and 'tis Idolatry in the* Papiſts *to worſhip the conſecrated Bread, though they think 'tis turned into the Body of Chriſt.* Text, 1 *Cor.* 11. 23, 24, 25. Serm. 21. p. 729.

XXIII *The* Papiſts *go preſumptuouſly againſt the Inſtitution of Chriſt, and change and corrupt his Ordinance, and are injurious to the people, in denying the uſe of the Cup to them*

in

in the Lords Supper. Text, *Mat.* 26, 27, 28. Ser. 22. p. 760.

XXIV. *In the Masse there is not a true and real Sacrifice of Christ himself for the sins of the Dead and Living.* Text, *Heb.* 10. 12. Ser. 23. p. 784.

XXV. *Popery is a Novelty, and the Protestant Religion was not only before* Luther, *but the same that was taught by Christ and his Apostls.* Text. *Jer.* 6. 16. *Ser.* 7. p. 165.

READER, The smaller Mistakes are left unto your Ingenuity to Correct; the grosser *Errata* are here amended.

ERRATA.

PAge 5, l. 16, r. *Master*, l. 10, r. *he*, p. 17, l. 1, r. *of thee*, p. 39, r. *detest*, p. 81. r. θεοὺς, p. 82, l. 15, r. *Rev.* 16. 13. p. 85, l. 7, r. *Graserus*, p. 85, l. 38, add *bringing in*, p. 96, l. 3, *Trinsingensis*, p. 97, l. 8, r. *then*, p. 98, r. *head*, p. 99, l. 27, r. *he looks*, p. 100, l. 23, r. *Officers*, p. 102, l. 6, r. *their*, l. 7. add *the*, l. 37, add *bid publick and open*, p. 106, l. 30, r. *turret*, p. 109, l. 27, r. *facilis*, p. 110, l. 26, r. *Scrinio*, p. 112, l. 1, r. *condonandi*, p. 113, l. 11, r. *Tarquin*, p. 118, l. 15, r. *saith one*, p. 122, l. 1, r. *let*, p. 141, l. 13, r. 12 *s.* p. 152, l. 37, r. *readiness*, p. 155, l. 3, r. *faith*, p. 263, l. 22, r. *ingeniously*, p. 266, l. 34, r. *offender*, p. 272, l. 26, dele *of*, p. 292, l. 16, r. *what a madness*, p. 275, l. 26, r. *gold.* † Page 404, l. 8, r. *actions*, p. 405, marg. r. *de prædest*: *& grat.* l. 42, r. *on*, p. 407, l. 2, r. *inflat*, l. 25, r. *& c.* l. 36, r. *Andradius*, p. 408, l. 4, r. *sentent.* l. 15, marg. r. *de condigno*, *&* l. 23, r. *convention*, l. 42, r. ἀπὸ, l. 44, r. πάν-τως, p. 409, marg. l. 5, r. παντε, p. 416. l. 8, marg. r. *consummando*, p. 418, l. 40, r. *the end to which it is*, p. 421, l. ult. r. *Jo.* 2. *Ep.* 8. p. 422, l. 2, r. 2. *merces*, p. 425, dele *othe*, p. 426, marg. l. 13, r. *tribuit*, p. 442, l. 16, r. 1 *Cor.* 6. 11. p. 443, l. 18, r. 1 *Jo.* 8. 9. marg. r. *& consilii*, p. 445. l. 16, add *him*, p 447, marg. r. *dominicus*, p. 448, l. 23, add *grace*, p. 449, l. 3, r. *retractation*, p. 450. l. 17, r. *darkness*, p. 451, l. 10, dele *of*, l. 20, add *or others*, p. 452, l. 1, add *we may get eternal life*, p. 455, marg. dele *c.* 2. p. 456, l. 34, r. *so fu*ⁿ, l. 34. add *or others for them*, p. 459, l. 13, for presently r. *pretendedly*, l. 19, for making r. *working*, p. 462, l. 2, for will r. *would*, l. 3, for part r. *piece*, l. 24, dele *one of*, l. 32, for our works r. *Civil worship*, p. 463, l. 11, add *also*, l. 22. dele *one of*, l. 23, for Prostrating r. *prostration*, p 466, l. 8, for how r. *now*, p. 463, l. 16, for transparent r. *transcendent*, p. 471, for lives r. *hearts*, p. 475, l. 2, for best r. *last*, p. 483, l for also r. *who*, *ibid.* dele *that*, p. 489, l. 17, for may r. *must*, p. 492. for save r. *serve*, p. 494. for thus r. *this*, for as r. *thou*, p. 495, marg. r *Arminius*, p. 513, r. αὐθαιρέτοι, p. 521, l. 29, r. *intention*, l. 38, for your r. *their*, p. 525, marg. r. *Excl-sia*, for *quid*, r. *quidem*, p. 527, l. 34, for scorned r. *seemed*, p. 530, l. 13, r. *vanity*, p. 531, marg. r. *sunt* for *sanct*, and *sunt &* for *sanctus est*, p. 539. r. ἀκίνσον, p. 547, l. 14, r. *des*, and add *des*, p. 548, marg. r. δεσπότης, p. 550, r. *here*, marg. r. *utilitas*, p. 551, r. *Matth.* 22. p. 552. r. *yea rather*, p. 553, marg. l. 2, r. ἀνθρώπων, p. 555, l. ult. r. *streams*, p. 557, l. 9, r. *shaveling*, and l. 14, for ευ r. ω, p. 558, l. 27, r. *fly*, p. 565, l. 1, for forbids r. *denies*, and l. 4, r. ἀξίως, p. 572, l. 2, for spiritual r. *Apostles*, p. 574, for Saints r. *Christ*, p. 580, l. 14, r. *Pseudo-Prophetarum*, p. 583, l 35, dele *of*, p. 603 l. 13, r. καθίσαντας, p. 611, l 20, r. *Alexanders*, p. 613, l. 39, r. *incestuosis*, p. 614, l. 30, r. *Setters*, l. 32, r. *buckstal*, in Tit. Ser. 18, r. *Believer his*, p. 619, marg. l. 14, r. *de sal. Cor. sect.* 3, p. 623, l. 42, r. δι καλῶν, ἔργων. p. 226, l. 13, for theirs r. *the Papists*, p. 627, l. 41, r. *single*, p. 630, l. 13, r. *as to*, p. 632, l. 38, for way r. *Eye*, p. 635, l. 40, for these r. *those*, p. 640, l. 40, marg. r. *incauto*, p. 641, l. 20, ὁ μετὰ λόγου p. 644, l. 3, r. *inartificiale*, p. 648, l. 29, dele *from Eternitie*, p 446, l. 25, dele *Colon.* * Page 701, l. 1, 4, r. *light*, l. 31, r. *tender*, p. 705, l. 13, r. *Sacraments*, p. 708, l. 20, r. vocati, l. 44, r. *commanded*, p. 710; l. 27, r. *rite*, p. 711, l. 14, r. *change*, p. 714, l. 34, r. *as*, p. 715. l. ult. dele *and that through final Infidelity*, p. 716, l. 39, dele *again*, p. 720, l. 41, r. *prevented*, p. 723, l. 6, that which is included in the Parentheses should have been set in the Margin, p. 725, l. 26, r. *counsel*, p. 726, l. 23, r. *as are intaild*, p. 727, l. 5, for their r. *both*, p. 784, for speaking r. *speaketh*, p. 788, dele for, and for in that r. *a*, p. 790, for it is r. *he is*, p. 791, for was r. *were*, p. 796, for off from r. *on*, and dele *in*, p. 806, for at r. *of*, p. 808, dele *to understand*, p. 814, l. 7, r. *from*, p. 816, l. 16, for *juis* r. *jam*, l. ult. r. *wasted*, p. 818, l. 15, r. *receive* p. 819, l. 2, r. *last*, l. 10, r. 2000, and l. 32, r. *desiring*, p. 828, l. 32, r. *justified* for sanctified, p. 830, l. 39, r. *Doctor*, p. 832, l. ult. r. *mouldring*, p. 834, l. 20, r. ἐκείνη, p. 834, l. 23, r. *called day*, p. 837, l. 23, r. gone.

POPE and COUNCILS not Infallible

Mr Mather Pool

Mat. 23. 8, 9, 10. *But be not ye called Rabbi, for one is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are Brethren.*
And call no man your Father upon the earth, for one is your Father which is in Heaven.
Neither be ye called Masters; for one is your Master, even Christ.

THE *But* in the beginning of these words hath a manifest respect unto the foregoing verses, wherein our blessed Saviour describes and censures the ambition and usurpation of the Scribes and Pharisees. He tells you in the fifth verse, *All their works they do to be seen of men*; not for the pleasing of God, but for gaining of reputation amongst men; not for the satisfaction of their own Consciences, but for vain glory and ostentation. *They made broad their Phylacteries*; the Phylacteries were little scrowls of Parchment which the *Jews* did wear upon their arms, or upon their foreheads, wherein they writ some parcels of the Law of God. How solidly grounded that practice was, I shall not now examine: But the Scribes and Pharisees made these Phylacteries larger and broader than the rest of the *Jews*, that they might gain that respect from the people by their outward garb, which they could not gain by any true and solid worth. It follows in the sixth verse. *They love the uppermost rooms at feasts, and the chief seats in the Synagogues*; and in the seventh verse, *and greetings in the Markets, and to be called of men Rabbi*; i.e. *Master* or *Doctor*; for so the word signifies; and the word is doubled for the greater honour and respect. They affected titles of honour, and the *Jewish* Sanhedrim did solemnly confer these titles upon learned men; and they obliged the people to give them these titles; and they had a saying, that *he that*

saluteth

saluteth his teacher as he doth another man, and doth not call him Rabbi, *provokes God to depart from Israel.*

But indeed there was a deeper and worse design than this in it; they did not only aim at splendid and glorious titles, but they did usurp Authority and Dominion over the Consciences of the People, whereof this was but a sign; as amongst us the Flag is a sign of the Dominion of the Seas, so this title was an indication and sign of that Authority they usurped over the people. Against this leaven of the Scribes and Pharisees, our Saviour cautions them in the words read, *Be ye not called Rabbi, call no man your Father upon earth; neither be ye called Masters.* The same thing thrice repeated in various expressions, to shew the *great importance* and *necessity* of this precept. But how is this to be understood? I answer, it is not a prohibition concerning the *use of the name*, but concerning the *practice of the thing*. You are not to understand it thus, as if it were unlawful to call any man *Father*, or *Master*, as the *Quakers* with sufficient weakness will understand it. Certainly the Apostles best understood the meaning of their Lord and Master; and for as much as we find that they themselves did give men these titles, we have warrant enough to use them, *Ephes.* 6. 4. *Fathers provoke not your Children to wrath*; and lest any man should have such an Allegorical humour as to understand it of spiritual Fathers, they are called *fathers of the flesh*, *Heb.* 12. 9. *We have had fathers of our flesh.* And so servants must *obey in all things their Masters according to the flesh*, Col. 3. 22. nay more, it is not unlawful to call teachers by these names; it is not unlawful to call Teachers, *Masters*, *Doctors*, *Rabbies*, 1 Cor. 4. 15. *For though you have ten thousand instructers in Christ, yet have you not many Fathers, for in Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the Gospel:* I am your Father, your spiritual Father, and the title of *Master* (διδάσκαλος) answers to *Rabbi* in the Hebrew, as the learned know, and plainly appears from *Joh.* 20. 16. *Jesus said unto her Mary, she turned her self about and said, Rabboni!* a word of the same signification with *Rabbi*, which is as much as to say *Master*. This name I say, is commonly given to Teachers and Ministers of the Gospel; *he sent some Apostles, and some teachers or Masters*, διδασκάλους, and so St. *Paul* calls himself διδάσκαλος, *a teacher, a Master, a Doctor of the Gentiles.*

What then is here forbidden?

Ans. Two things. (1) He forbids a vain and ambitious affectation of such titles of honour as these. (2) And principally he forbids that Authority and Dominion over the Consciences of men which these titles do import. I shall say nothing to the former, the latter is that I must discourse of at this time. And to this purpose, and that you may the better understand the mind of our blessed Saviour in these words; you must know that the Scribes and Pharisees did arrogate to themselves this Authority over the people, the self-same Power which the Popish teachers at this day usurp over their people. This was their doctrine,

ctrine, That the People were obliged to believe all their Doctrines, and to practise all their Injunctions. These are the very words of the *Jewish Talmud*, which is as it were their Bible. *All the words of our Rabbins are to be believed, and received, as the very words of the living God.* And in another place, *We owe the same faith to all which the Rabbins teach in their homilies, which we give to the Law of Moses.* Nay they went so far as to say, (as Rabbi *Solomon* an eminent Doctor of theirs saith upon *Deut.* 17. 11.) *Thou shalt not depart from the words of the wise*, i.e. *their Teachers, though they tell thee that thy right hand is thy left, and thy left hand is thy right*; and in another place, *he that dissents from his Teachers, is as bad as he that dissents from the Divine Majesty; and he that believes the words of the wise, it is as if he did believe God himself.* Nay they went higher, *My Son attend rather to the words of the Scribes than to the words of the Law.*

Now by this you may clearly understand what our Saviour aims at, and why he presseth this point with so much vehemency; you see the very life and soul of Religion was struck at by this intolerable Usurpation. Therefore our Saviour saith, *call no man Rabbi, call no man your Father upon earth*; let none of my Disciples or Apostles ever usurp this Authority; and if any of them should be so arrogant as to do it, let no man give this title to them; that is, acknowledg not this Authority to be in them; own no man for your Father or Master on Earth, except my self or your Father in Heaven.

From the words thus explained I gather this Doctrine.

Doct. *There is no external, supream and infallible Judg in the Church of God, to whom all Christians are obliged to submit their Faith and Consciences, in all matters of Religion.*

This was the point that I was desired to discourse of at this time; and I do it the more willingly, because in the whole body of Popery, the opposite Doctrine to this is the heart of it. This is *Articulus stantis, vel cadentis Papismi:* Popery will either stand or fall by the truth or falshood of this Assertion. It is usual with Papists confidently to invite us to the debate of this Doctrine, concerning the supream and infallible Judg of Controversies; this they all acknowledg, strikes at the root; and we do but nibble at the branches, unless we strike at this.

Now that you may the better understand this Discourse, I must acquaint you with the Doctrine of the Papists in this particular. They are not content with Christ the Judg in Heaven, and the holy Scriptures the Judg upon Earth; but they must have another Judg, a visible Judg; like the Israelites they must have a visible God to go before them, though it be but a Calf. They say (1) that an external and visible Judg of all matters of Religion upon Earth is absolutely necessary; and this Judg they say is the Church, by which they understand

the Governours of the Church, either the Pope, as ſome of them ſay, or as others, a General Council, or the Pope and a Council together, as thoſe that would ſeem wiſer than the reſt pretend.

(2) They ſay, this ſupream Judg is infallible; he can neither be deceived himſelf, nor deceive them that ſtick to him, and are taught by him.

(3) They ſay it is the duty of every particular Chriſtian intirely and unreſervedly to ſubmit his Faith and Conſcience to the conduct and guidance of this Judg, to believe whatever he teacheth, and to practiſe whatever he commands, according to that known and often mentioned, and never to be forgotten Aſſertion of *Bellarmine*, *De Pontifice Rom.* l. 4. cap. 5. *in fine. If*, ſaith he, *the Pope could or ſhould ſo far err, as to command the practice of vice, and to forbid vertuous actions, the Church were bound to believe vices to be good, and vertues to be bad.* This is plain dealing; and I cannot but adore the wiſe and wonderful Providence of God, that ſhould give up a perſon of ſuch wiſdom and learning as *Bellarmine*, to diſcover the true and the deſperate conſequences of this principle, that all men that have a care of their Souls might avoid and abhor it.

This is the ſum of their Doctrine; and they further add, that this Doctrine of the Churches ſupream and infallible Authority, as it is of more weight and importance, ſo it is, and in all reaſon ought to be more evident and demonſtrable than any other Chriſtian Doctrine whatſoever, as a learned Doctor of the *Romiſh* Church expreſly affirms, I mean *Creſſy* in his *Exomologeſis*; whether this be ſo or no we ſhall by and by diſcern. And againſt this bold and wicked Aſſertion I have laid down this Propoſition, *There is no external ſupream, infallible Judg in the Church of God, to whom all Chriſtians are obliged to ſubmit their Faith and Conſciences in all matters of Religion.* That which I am now pleading for is, that you may preſerve the greateſt treaſure you have in the world, even your Conſciences, againſt the horrible Uſurpations of wicked and unreaſonable men. I ſhall not uſe multitudes of Arguments to confute the Popiſh Aſſertion, but a few, and thoſe ſuch as may convince the Conſcience of any perſon, who will not ſhut his eyes againſt the light.

Arg. 1. This Authority which they pretend to is a greater Authority than the Apoſtles themſelves did ever claim, or exerciſe in the Church of God; as plainly appears from 2 *Cor.* 1. 24. *Not that we have dominion over your Faith.* I do not underſtand what dominion over a mans Faith can be, if this that they pretend to be not ſo. God himſelf can ſcarce be imagined to have a greater dominion over any mans Faith than this, that a man be obliged to believe every thing which God ſaith without examination, and practiſe whatſoever he commands; and this the Pope lays claim to, as you have heard, and it is notoriouſly known; by which alone you may ſufficiently diſcern who is that Man of Sin propheſied of, 2 *Theſ.* 2. 4. *Who oppoſeth and exalteth himſelf*

above

above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the Temple of God, shewing himself that he is God. This was our blessed Saviours sole Prerogative, *Act. 3. 22. Moses truly said unto the Fathers, a Prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren like unto me, him shall ye hear; in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you.* So that this is the heighth of Christs honour; and the truth is, it might well be said of Christ, we may safely relie upon and hear Christ in all things whatsoever he should say to us; this was very agreeable to the nature and person of Christ, one *in whom were all the treasures of wisdom and knowledg, one in whom the fulness of the Godhead dwelt bodily*, one that was *God manifested in the flesh:* I say, we may safely relie upon such a person; but that this should be said of a weak and wicked man, such as themselves confess many of their Popes to have been, that we should hear whatever he says; this is such a stupendious usurpation, that I can never think of it with horror enough. The holy Apostles thought it good manners to keep a distance from their Lord and maker, they never durst arrogate such an absolute and unlimited Authority to themselves. Witness that evident place, *Gal. 1. 8, 9. Though we or an Angel from heaven preach any other Gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed.* And as I said before, so say I now again, *If any man* (be what he will, the Pope or a Council, or any company of men, for *ubi lex non distinguit, non est distinguendum*, God makes no difference or exception here, neither must we) *preach any other Gospel unto you than that you have received, let him be accursed.* And do you not think this would be another Gospel if any man should say, that vices were vertues, and sins duties, and consequently that unbelief and impenitency were Gospel-duties, would not this be another Gospel? and you see they allow this Authority to the Pope. If the Pope teach so, you are bound to believe so; but this was not Saint *Pauls* mind, *Though we or an Angel from Heaven preach any other Gospel,* do not only disbelieve him, but curse him to his face; it may be he will curse you, and pronounce an Anathema against you, and roar with his Bulls against you; but regard not that, *the curse causless shall not come*, Prov. 26. 2. but the curse shall rest upon himself.

Arg. 2. Such an Authority as they pretend to, is contrary to that command of the trial of Doctrines, which is laid upon all Christians; for if there be an infallible Judg to whom I ought to submit my Faith and Conscience in all matters of Religion, what need I try Doctrins? certainly there is no room left for it; and therefore the Papists laying down that Assertion, they do with very good sense collect this Conclusion from it, That you owe an implicite Faith to all their Doctrins, and blind obedience to all their commands; it is *Bellarmines* Assertion, *A Christian*, saith he, *should receive all the Doctrins of the Church without any examination.* Now let us see whether this be the mind of God or no; if it be, than they are in the right; if not, than it is an abomina-

ble

ble Uſurpation. If we conſult the holy Scriptures, we ſhall find that no Chriſtian is to offer to God a blind ſacrifice, but a reaſonable ſervice. 1 *Pet.* 3. 15. *Be ready always to give an anſwer to every man that asketh you a reaſon of the hope that is in you.* It is not the Colliers reaſon will ſerve the turn, nor the Colliers Faith, to believe he knows not why; this is not to give a reaſon of our hope, 1. *Joh.* 4. 1. *Beloved, believe not every ſpirit,* (that is every teacher that pretends to be led by the ſpirit) *but try the ſpirits whether they are of God, becauſe many falſe Prophets are gone out into the world.* God hath given us ſufficient warning, that there ſhould be a great and a general defection amongſt Profeſſors, yea amongſt the Preachers of the Goſpel, 1 *Tim.* 4. 1. *Now the Spirit ſpeaketh expreſly, that in the latter times ſome ſhall depart from the faith, giving heed to ſeducing ſpirits, and Doctrines of Devils.* Act. 20. 30. *Alſo of your own ſelves ſhall men ariſe, ſpeaking perverſe things to draw away Diſciples after them, &c.* 2 Pet. 2. 1, 2. *But there were falſe Prophets alſo amongſt the people, even as there ſhall be falſe Teachers among you, who privily ſhall bring in damnable hereſies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and many ſhall follow their pernicious ways.* Well now, what is the remedy againſt this doleful diſeaſe? be not ſurprized when you ſee various and contrary opinions in the Church; it is no more than was foretold by all the Apoſtles. But now what ſhall Chriſtians do in this diſtreſſed condition and contradiction of opinions? what was the remedy preſcribed in caſe of falſe Prophets of old? and what is the remedy in caſe of falſe Teachers now? Why it is trial. Chriſtians are commanded to try them. There were two ways propoſed to try the Prophets of old; the one was by the event. *Deut.* 18. 21, 22. *And if thou ſay in thine heart, how ſhall we know the word which the Lord hath not ſpoken, when the Prophet ſpeaketh in the name of the Lord, if the thing follow not, nor come to paſs, that is the thing which the Lord hath not ſpoken; but the Prophet hath ſpoken it preſumptuouſly, thou ſhalt not be afraid of him.* And the other way of trial was by the Scripture, *Iſa.* 8. 20. *To the Law and to the Teſtimony, if they ſpeak not according to this word, it is becauſe there is no light in them;* and Ver. 16. *Bind up the Teſtimony, ſeal the Law among my Diſciples.* And *Verſ.* 18, 19. *Behold I and the Children whom the Lord hath given me are for ſigns and for wonders in Iſrael, and when they ſhall ſay unto you, ſeek unto them that have familiar ſpirits, and unto wizards, that peep, and that mutter, ſhall not a people ſeek unto their God? for the living to the dead?* The way to diſcover theſe deluſions is to enquire, and that is by the Law and by the Teſtimony, and this the people were obliged to. And ſo this is the remedy preſcribed in the New Teſtament; I need inſtance but in that place, 1 *Theſ.* 5. 21. *Prove all things, hold faſt that which is good.* Prove all things, who is this that is required to do it? it may be it is the Pope, it may be it is a general Council, and they indeed muſt prove all things; no, read the firſt verſe of the firſt Chapter, *Paul and Sylvanus, and Timotheus unto the Church of the Theſſalonians*

in

in God our Father; the Members of the Church, these are here commanded to prove all things, and hold fast that which is good. The same persons are obliged to *prove all things*, who are obliged *to hold fast that which is good*: and since it is confessed the latter clause belongs to the people, so must the former also. Consider three things. (1.) Christians have Ability to try things with. (2.) They have a Rule to try things by. And (3.) They have a Promise of discovery; and I think more is not necessary.

First, Christians have Ability to try things with, they have reasonable faculties, they are capable of judging between things that differ; the Apostle speaks to the Church of the *Corinthians*; 1 Cor. 10. 15. *I speak as to wise men, judg ye what I say.* Christians, as well as Ministers, have the Spirit of God which enables them to judg of spiritual things. 2 *Cor.* 2. 15. *He that is spiritual* (that is, he that hath the Spirit of God) *judgeth all things.* He is capable of judging between Doctrine and Doctrine, between Precept and Precept, between Practice and Practice; and upon the warrant of this Text, and many others, I dare affirm, that a serious, godly, discreet Christian, is a more competent judge of many divine Truths, than the greatest Scholar in the World, that wants the direction of the Spirit of God: add to this what our Saviour saith, *John* 10. 4, 5. and remember he speaks not of the Shepherds, but of the Sheep; *my sheep hear my voice, and they follow me; a stranger they will not follow, but will fly from him: for they know not the voice of strangers.* You see the Sheep are indued by God with faculties, they can distinguish between Christ and a Stranger, between Christ and Anti-christ.

Secondly, Christians have a certain Rule to try things by, and that is the holy Scriptures, to which Christ commanded the Jews to bring all his doctrines, Joh. 5. 39. *Search the Scriptures.* Acts 17. 11. *These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures dayly whether those things were so.* 2 Pet. 1. 19. *We have also a more sure word of Prophesy* (the Prophecies of the *Old Testament* compared with the events and doctrines of the *New*) *whereunto you do well that you take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place.* Pray observe, 1. Who writes this, it is *Peter*, he from whom the Pope claims all the power he hath; and yet *Peter* saith, you do well to take heed to the Scriptures. I know the Popes are grown wiser since, they have corrected *Peter*; they say, People do ill to take heed to the Scriptures; they say, it is the fountain of all heresie, for people to study the Scripture: our Saviour said, it was the fountain of all error that men did not understand the Scriptures; *You err, because you know not the Scriptures.* Matt. 22. 29. The Pope saith, Men err because they will know and read the Scriptures. 2. To whom he writes this, look upon the endorsement of his Epistle: Peradventure he writes thus to his Successors; No, but *to them:*

them that have obtained like pretious faith with us, *v.* 1. of this chapter.

Thirdly, Christians have a promise of discovery upon Trial; 2 *Prov.* 4. 5. *If thou seekest her* (that is wisdom) *as silver, and searchest for her as for hid treasures, then shalt thou understand the fear of the Lord, and find the knowledg of God*; Joh. 7. 17. *If any man will do his will he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God, or whether I speak of my self.*

Arg. 3. Against the Supremacy and the infallible Authority of the Pope is taken from the danger of following false guides. People may sin in following their guides and teachers; this the Papists deny; they say that People are obliged to believe their Teachers, and if they do so, they are free from sin and danger; and if their Doctrine be true, it must needs be so. This is that I must now briefly examine, as that which alone will decide the whole controversy; when *Aaron* taught the people to worship the golden calf, and proclaim'd, *to morrow is a feast unto the Lord*, *Exod.* 32. 5. Did the people sin in obeying *Aarons* doctrine, and complying with his precepts, or did they not? I think nothing is more plain, than that they did sin in it: *vers.* 31. *And Moses returned unto the Lord, and said, Oh! this people hath sinned a great sin.* Not only *Aaron* sinned in teaching this doctrine, but the people sinned in believing this doctrine: and in *Vers.* 35. *And the Lord plagued the people because they made the calfe which Aaron made*, or, as the words may very well be interpreted, *because they worshipped the calfe, or sacrificed to the calfe, which Aaron made.*

So you see plainly, the people sinned, and were plagued because they followed the Doctrine of *Aaron*: and so in *Isa.* 3. 12. *O my people, they which lead thee, cause thee to err*, by their corrupt doctrines and sinful practices; and yet this did not at all excuse them: for *Isa.* 24. 1, 2, 3. *Behold, the Lord maketh the earth* (that is, the Land) *empty, and maketh it wast, and turneth it upside down, and scattereth abroad the inhabitants thereof; and it shall be, as with the people, so with the priest, as with the servant so with his master*, as with the leader so with the follower: The Priest shall be punished sorely for misguiding the people, and the people shall be punished for following them. To come lower, to the Priests and Rulers of the Church in our blessed Saviours time; the chief Priest and the great Council at *Jerusalem* then were, as the Papists confess, the supreme and infallible Judges of all the matters of Religion, as the Pope at least with a general Council pretends to be at this day. These infallible Judges, are called *blind guides*, Matt. 23. 16. *Woe unto you blind guides*; they were universally enemies to Christ; *John* 7. 48. *Have any of the Rulers or of the Pharisees believed on him?* They accounted Christ an impostor; *Matt.* 27. 63. The very words of their great Council are these, *Sir, we remember that that deceiver said, while he was yet alive; after three days I will rise*

riſe again; theſe were the men that ſtirred up the people againſt Chriſt. *Matt.* 27. 20. *But the chief Prieſts and Elders perſwaded the multitude, that they ſhould ask Barrabas, and deſtroy Jeſus.* You ſee nothing is more plain; no adverſary can be ſo impudent as to deny this, that the high Prieſts and the great Council of the Jews did unanimouſly agree in preaching this Doctrine, that Chriſt was a deceiver. Now the queſtion is, whether the people did well in believing this Doctrine, or not. Certainly if the Popiſh Doctrine be true, the people did well in following the high Prieſts direction, and ſo the Papiſts affirm; they are the words of *Becanus*, in his *Manual of Controverſies*, *The whole people of the Jews, in the matters of Religion were bound to follow what the high Prieſt ſaid*, and the greateſt of their Divines, even *Bellarmine* expreſly ſays, that *the people were bound to ſtand to the high Prieſts judgment; whatſoever ſentence he ſhould deliver.* Now we ſay, they did ſin in believing their Teachers; let us both hear what Chriſt ſays, and no more need be ſaid againſt this abominable Aſſertion, nor for the deciding of this queſtion, and eſtabliſhing you againſt this Doctrine. What can be more plain than that paſſage of our Saviours, *Matt.* 15. 14? *Let them alone, they be blind leaders of the blind, and if the blind lead the blind, both ſhall fall into the ditch.* You ſee, he that follows a blind leader is puniſhed as well as he that leads him, both fall into the Ditch. And *Acts* 3. 17. When the Apoſtle was Preaching to the Jews, *I wot*, ſays he, *that through ignorance you did it*, (that is, you crucified Chriſt) *as did alſo your rulers.* Ignorance it was in the Prieſts, and ignorance it was in the people; and the people, ſay the Papiſts, are excuſable, becauſe they were bound to follow the Prieſts; but did this make it no ſin in the people? Let us hear what Saint *Peter* ſays, *Acts* 2. 23. *Him, being delivered by the determinate counſel and foreknowledg of God you have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and ſlain:* Neither Gods decree, nor the high Prieſts miſguidance did at all excuſe them from that wicked act; and as they ſaid, *His blood be upon us and our children*, ſo we ſee that ſad Curſe is upon them to this day; *Wrath is come upon them to the uttermoſt*, as the Apoſtle ſays, 1 *Theſ.* 2. 16. And if we ſearch this matter a little further, it will more evidently appear, and indeed afford another undeniable Argument to confirm this Truth. Here were two contrary Authorities, God and Chriſt in his name on the one ſide, and the Authority of the Church on the other ſide. Chriſt commands the Jews to believe in him, *John* 6. 29. when they asked him, *What ſhall we do that we may work the works of God?* What does God require of us? Jeſus anſwered and ſaid unto them, *This is the work of God, that you believe on him whom he hath ſent:* and the great Doctrine, you know, Preached by Chriſt, was, *Repent and believe the Goſpel*; and Chriſt tells them, *Joh.* 3. 36. *He that believeth on the Son hath everlaſting life, and he that believeth not the Son, ſhall not ſee life, but the wrath of God abideth on him.* And the Arguments our Saviour brings to prove

himself to be the Messias, and to oblige them to believe, they are principally two. The first is the works he did, *Joh.* 5.36. *The works that I do bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me.* And the second is the Scriptures, *vers.* 39. of that Chapter, *Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testifie of me*; and in vers. 46. *Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me, for he wrote of me*; this for the one side. On the other side stands the Authority of the Church, the Supream and Infallible Judg of Controversies, as the Papists say these were; *The chief Priests and Elders, and all the Council, sought false witness against Jesus, to put him to death*, Mat. 26. 59. and *vers.* 65. the high Priest pronounceth, *he hath spoken blasphemy, what further need have we of witnesses, behold now you have heard his blasphemy, what think ye?* and the rest consent to his sentence; vers. 66. *and they answered and said, he is guilty of death.* And *the Jews had agreed already that if any man did confess that he was Christ, he should be put out of the Synagogue*, Joh. 9. 22.

Now then the question lies here, whether the *Jews* were obliged to believe Christ in this case, or whether they were obliged to believe the High Priest and Sanhedrim, and the Church of the *Jews*. And methinks the very mentioning of it should presently determine it in all your thoughts; it is so prodigious a thing that the Church should set up it self in opposition to Christ, that no man can hear it without tingling ears. Saint *Peter* hath decided it, *Act.* 5. 29. *Then Peter and the other Apostles answered and said, we ought to obey God rather than man*; we ought to believe God rather than man. Can any man that hath the understanding of a man in him, or the Conscience of a Christian, think that the people of the *Jews*, that the Disciples and Apostles of our Lord did sin in believing in him, because it was contrary to the command of the High Priest and Church of the *Jews*? Can any man think their Unbelief was their duty? or that the Authority of the Church could make void the command of God? or that the *Jews* did but their duty in believing Christ to be a deceiver? These are stupendious and prodigious assertions; and yet all these and many more must be digested, or else they must part with their fundamental Doctrine. And just as the case of the *Jews* was then, so is our case now; for example, God clearly and plainly commands me, as plainly as words can express it, *Exod.* 20. 4, 5. *Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven Image, or any likeness of any thing that is in Heaven above, or that is in the Earth beneath, or that is in the water under the Earth, thou shalt not bow down thy self to them, nor serve them.* And *Mat.* 4. 10. says our Saviour, *It is written, thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.* The Church of *Rome* comes and teaches us a quite contrary doctrine; they say, *thou shalt worship graven Images, and Saints, and Angels, and not God only*; the question is, which of these two we must believe, and whose command we ought to obey? whether the Children must obey God

God their Father, or the Church their Mother? whether I must believe the Word of God, which is confest to be so by the Papists themselves, or the word of man, which they vainly pretend to be the Word of God? let the 1 *Joh.* 5. 9. determine this Controversie, *if we receive the witness of man, the witness of God is greater.* The witness of God certainly ought to be preferred before the witness of man; add to this *Mat.* 15. 6. *You have made the commandment of God of none effect by your Traditions.* And vers. 9. *in vain do they worship me, teaching for Doctrines the commandments of men*; and tell me what is it to make void the commandments of God by mens Traditions, if this be not?

Arg. 4. *and last.* Against this Doctrine is from the want of a Divine Appointment and Promise; we must remember the question our Saviour puts, *Luk.* 12. 14. *Man, who made me a judg or a divider over you?* And that passage, *Heb.* 5. 4. *No man taketh this honour to himself, but he that was called of God as was Aaron.* If there be such a Soveraign and Infallible Judg as the *Papists* pretend there is, and the *Pope* be he, this Judg ought in all reason to produce his commission, and shew his letters patents for it. It is confessed on all hands that man is of himself a vain and foolish creature, full of ignorance, apt to error, that loves darkness rather than light; *Men of low degree are vanity, and men of high degree are a lye*, Psal. 62. 9. the minds of all men do need renovation, or else they are not capable of discerning Divine things. Now if any man pretend to an exemption from the common infirmities and corruptions of humane nature, this man ought to produce his writ of priviledg, and to shew wherein, and how he hath such an exemption. Certainly if any pretends to be infallibly guided by God in all things, he can claim it only from the grace of God, and by vertue of Gods Promise; but such Promise there is none. I acknowledg the Papists pretend they have such a promise, that I shall next examine. And here are two things to be enquired into: (1) To whom this commission and promise is given, and this is the foundation of all the rest; for though it should appear, that God had made a Promise of infallible guidance to some person or persons; yet unless it plainly appear to whom that promise is made, no man can lay claim to it, or have any benefit by it.

Now let us enquire to whom this Promise is made; the Papists say, it is made to the Church; but, say I, what do they mean by the Church? say they, it is to the Governours of the Church; but go a little further, and what do they mean by the Governours of the Church? and herein they most horribly break into pieces; this Doctrine they say, as you have heard, is of more importance than any Doctrine whatsoever, and so ought to be proved with the greater evidence, than any other. But when we come to examine it, their evidences are so obscure and inevident that they are not sufficient to convince their own Brethren; It belongs say some of them to the Pope, to the Bishop of *Rome*; say others,

no, it belongs to a General Council, and these opinions are quite contrary one to another; and this difference is not only amongst obscure and private persons, but their greatest Doctors; there is University against University, City against City, Kingdom against Kingdom. So that till they be agreed, to whom this Promise is made, they can make no benefit of the claim, nor are we obliged to follow them.

2. Where this Grant and Promise is? the Papists answer, it is contained in the holy Scriptures; and here they muster up some Promises as they call them, that confer this privileg either upon the Pope, or a General Council; and this I shall briefly examine. Only in general observe three things.

1. More clear and expres's Promises than any they pretend to did not secure the Church of God formerly from error, and therefore it is a vain thing for them to expect it now. I will deal so charitably with our adversaries, because they want proofs as to help the infirmity of their cause. We will suppose there were such a text as this, *In the Church of Rome shall my name be for ever*; sure they would desire no more than this; they would say, it is plain from hence that the Church of *Rome* is infallible. But I say, if there were so plain a proof, yet that would not be sufficient to prove it infallible, or to secure the Church from Error, and that I will prove by a plain instance. God speaks concerning the Temple of *Jerusalem*, 2 Chron. 7. 16. *For now I have chosen and sanctified this house which thou hast built, to put my name there for ever, and mine eyes, and my heart shall be there perpetually.* You see, here is the same Promise which I supposed made to *Jerusalem*; but how far this was from securing the Church of *Jerusalem*, the high Priests and his Brethren from Error and Apostacy, doth sufficiently appear from those frequent and grievous complaints of the Prophets, concerning the universal depravation of that Church, and particularly of the Priests of it, from the instances of the gross errors and miscarriages of the High Priests and others; and particularly it is put out of all dispute by that fatal and damnable Error of that Church in the condemnation of Christ.

2. Gods Promise of leading them into all truth is suspended upon certain conditions. The Spirit of truth you know is only promised to them that ask him, *Luk.* 11. 13. *How much more shall your heavenly father give the holy Spirit to them that ask him*; and it is supposed that they must ask aright; for *you ask and receive not, because you ask amiss*, Jam. 4.3. and in the place forementioned, *Joh.*7.17. *If any man will do his will, he shall know the Doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of my self*; where you see the knowing of the Doctrine of Christ is suspended upon the doing of Gods will. Now then for as much as the Church of *Rome* hath apparently broken the condition God requires, as no man that reads their own Historians can doubt, no wonder if God according to his commination in that case, *make them to know his breach of Promise.*

3. The

3. The Promiſes which they pretend to are ſo dark and obſcure that they do not convince many of their own Brethren; therefore it is a ridiculous thing to think they ſhould convince Proteſtants. For inſtance, I told you they were horribly divided in that fundamental Doctrine of the Infallible Judg, that ſome place this Infallibility in the Pope, and others in the Council. Now whereas the Promiſes they pretend to are of two ſorts, ſome pretend this Infallible Authority to be in the Pope, and ſome in a General Council. Thoſe that ſay it is in the Pope, do both ſlight and diſpute againſt thoſe arguments that are brought to prove it to be in the Council, and on the contrary thoſe that believe the Infallibility to be in the Council, deſpiſe and confute thoſe Arguments which are brought for the Infallibility of the Pope. This being premiſed, I come particularly, but briefly (becauſe I have diſcuſſed them elſewhere) to the Promiſes pretended for this uſurped Authority. Firſt for the Pope, and then for the Council.

For the Pope they tell us this ſtory; That Saint *Peter* was made by Chriſt the Supream and Infallible Judg of all Matters and Controverſies of Religion, and that *Peters* Succeſſors, the Popes and Biſhops of *Rome* are inveſted with the ſame Authority and Priviledg; and this they ſay, is evident from Scripture, and hath been owned by the Church of God in all ages from Chriſts time till *Luthers* days: this is the *Romiſh* Legend, to which I anſwer; this Doctrine hath no foundation in Scripture; the places they alledg for it are principally two.

1. Their firſt place is *Mat.* 16. 18. *And I ſay alſo unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell ſhall not prevail againſt it.* Therefore *Peter*, and conſequently all his Succeſſors the Popes, are the Rock upon which the Church is built; and therefore have the Supream and Infallible Judgment, to whom all perſons muſt ſubmit their Faith and Practice.

Anſ. 1. It is plain enough, that it is not *Peters* Perſon, but *Peters* Doctrine which our Saviour doth here ſpeak of. *Peter* had made a glorious confeſſion, *verſ.* 16. *Thou art Chriſt the Son of the living God*; and *verſ.* 17. *Jeſus anſwered and ſaid unto him, bleſſed art thou Simon Barjonas; for fleſh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in Heaven.* And for a further confirmation of this Truth, he adds, *I ſay unto thee, thou art Peter*, (he mentions *Peters* name by way of alluſion), *and upon this Rock*, that is, this Confeſſion made and delivered by thee, *I will build my Church, and the gates of hell ſhall not prevail againſt it.*

2. If it were *Peters* perſon, and if he were called a Rock, and a Foundation of the Church, yet all this will not prove him to be infallible, much leſs his Succeſſors. The proper and primary Foundation of the Church *Peter* was not; witneſs that evident place, 1 *Cor.* 3. 11. *For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid which is Jeſus Chriſt*; in a ſecondary and Miniſterial ſenſe *Peter* was a Foundation, and ſo were all

the

the reſt of the Apoſtles; 2 *Epheſ.* 2. 20. *You are built upon the foundation of the Apoſtles and Prophets*; *i.e.* upon the Doctrine delivered by the Apoſtles and Prophets not upon their Perſons (for then the Prophets could never have come in for a ſhare), and therefore in like manner (if you will allow Scripture to be its own interpreter) when *Peter* is called a Rock or Foundation, it is not his Perſon, but his Doctrine to which that title belongs. *Rev.* 21. 14. *The wall of the City* (the new Jeruſalem, the Church of God) *had twelve foundations, and in them the names of the twelve Apoſtles of the Lamb.* Here is no prerogative of *Peter*, but all are equally foundations.

3. The Promiſe of Infallibility doth not belong to *Peter*, but unto the Church, *the gates of hell ſhall not prevail againſt it*; prevail againſt what or whom? againſt the Church; it is not the Rock upon which the Church is built, but the Church which is built upon that Rock, unto which that ſecurity is promiſed; he doth not ſay, *the gates of hell ſhall not prevail againſt thee*, much leſs doth he ſay, the gates of hell ſhall not prevail againſt thy Succeſſors to the end of the world; but *the gates of hell ſhall not prevail againſt the Church.* So that though *Peter* dies, and all his Succeſſors ſhould prove (as a great number of the Popes have done) Apoſtates from the Faith, yet ſtill the Church remains built upon the Rock.

4. This Promiſe is made to the true, inviſible and ſincere Profeſſors of the Goſpel-Church; this is evident from the accompliſhment of the Promiſe. The Promiſe is, *the gates of hell ſhall not prevail againſt the Church*; and it is manifeſt the gates of hell did and do prevail againſt all other perſons except the ſincere Profeſſors of the Goſpel; therefore thoſe perſons that are ſaid to be Infallible, and ſecure againſt all danger, are only the true and inviſible members of the Church.

2. The other place is, *Luk.* 22. 31, 32. *And the Lord ſaid, Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath deſired to have you, that he may ſift you as wheat; but I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not*: therefore, ſay they, *Peter* did not err in the Faith, and conſequently the Popes his Succeſſors, cannot err; but alas, what vain and ridiculous Arguments are theſe? Nothing is more evident, than that this Promiſe, or Prayer rather of Chriſt doth not concern any Infallibility in the Doctrine of Faith, but his eſtabliſhment in the grace of Faith; if you conſider *Peter* was not ſo much miſtaken in his judgment, the opinion of *Peter* concerning Chriſt was not changed, it was not ſo much an error of his mind as an error in his practice. *Peter* was afraid of ſuffering, and ſlaviſh fear made him ſpeak againſt his own Conſcience, when he ſaid, *I know not the man*; and his miſcarriage was in his tongue, not in his judgment; ſo that it is plain it was the grace of Faith that was there ſhaken, and not the Doctrine of Faith, and therefore no Infallibility can be pretended from it. And here I might deſiſt, but for more abundant confutation of this abſurd and abominable Doctrine, I ſhall ſhew that as they cannot prove it from

from Scripture, we can disprove it from Scripture. I hope I shall make it plain from Scripture, that the Doctrine of *Peters* Infallibility and Supream Authority in the Church of God was not received after Christs death; for this I shall offer two Arguments.

1. That *Peter* no where challengeth this power.

2. The Apostles no where give it him; therefore it is an intolerable arrogance that his Successors should claim it.

1. *Peter* did not challenge it. It is observable, that in the Gospel of *Mark*, which the learned believe was indited by *Peters* direction, there is not so much as a repetition of that famous Text, *Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my Church.* *Peter* durst not have omitted it, if it had been so fundamental a Doctrine as the Papists would have it. And afterward *Peter* writes two Epistles, and there is not one syllable in either of them concerning this Authority; but some may possibly say, this was *Peters* modesty, that he would not take it to himself. But certainly *Peter* durst not exercise his modesty to the impeachment of his fidelity, and the concealment of so necessary and important a Truth; but he would and ought to have done as *Paul* did, who when his Authority was opposed by false Teachers, he asserts and vindicates, and (as himself expresseth it) *magnifieth his office*, Rom. 11. 13. and so no doubt *Peter* would and should have done had he really had that Supream Power which the Papists for their own sakes would fasten upon him; and because he did not, it is a great presumption he had it not.

2. The other Apostles no where give this honour to *Peter*, but rather by their practices shew themselves to be of a contrary opinion; which I think will be sufficiently evident to all sober discreet and disinteressed persons from two places of Scriptures, which methinks might suffice for the determination of this Controversie.

The one is, *Act.* 15. where I must first remind you that at this time our blessed Saviour was dead, and Saint *Peter* by the Doctrine of the Papists, was supposed to be in the actual exercise of his Headship over the Church, to be the Supream and Infallible Judg of all Controversies; and if they say true, he was believed and known to be so by all the rest of the Apostles, and all the Christians of that age; whether it were so or no we shall see by this Chapter. A controversie ariseth in the Church; well, what do they do for the resolution of it? *Act.* 15. 1, 2. *They go up to Jerusalem, to the Apostles and Elders about this question.* Why did they not go to *Peter* if he were the Infallible Judg? it was a vain and frivolous thing to call them all together, if *Peter* alone might determine it. But it may be these were the Christians at *Antioch*, and they did not well understand *Peters* Supremacy and Infallibility, but the Church of *Jerusalem* understood it better; well, let us examine that too, in *vers.* 6. *the Apostles and Elders came together to consider of this matter*; Saint *Peter* was no more consulted with than the rest: in the 7. vers. *Peter* spake in the Assembly, and delivers his opinion, *vers.* 10. *Now therefore, why*

tempt

tempt ye God to put a yoke upon the neck of the Disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear? the yoke of the Ceremonial Law is wholly to be taken off from the necks of Christians, and no burden should be laid upon them. After him *James* comes and delivers another opinion, different from *Peters*, vers. 19,20. *My sentence is, that we trouble not them which from among the Gentiles are turned to God, but that we write unto them, that they abstain from pollutions of Idols, and from fornication, and from things strangled, and from blood*; as if he had said, I am not altogether of *Peters* mind, I would not have all these things wholly and on a sudden discharged. It is but meet that some respect and tenderness should be shewn to the believing *Jews*, and that we should become all things to all men that we may save some; and therefore it is fit we should a little comply with the *Jews*, not to impose Circumcision, but *to abstain from pollutions of idols, and from fornication, and from things strangled, and from blood.* And the manner of his expression here is very observable; My *sentence is*, Διὸ ἐγὼ κρίνω, *Wherefore I thus determine and conclude.* He doth not say, according to the present stile of the *Romanists*, and as he ought to have done, if their Doctrine were true, *I do in all humility present my opinion to the Vicar of Christ, the Prince of the Apostles, the Supream and Infallible Judg of this and all other Controversies, to whom I freely and fully submit my thoughts and judgment*; but barely relates part of *Peters* discourse, and then concludes with a kind of definitive sentence. And which is further considerable, this great Council prefers *James* his opinion before *Peters*, and the Decree runs in *James* his words, *vers. 29. That ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication, from which if ye keep your selves, ye shall do well.* Can any man in his right senses imagine that things would have been thus managed if *Peter* had been the Supream and Infallible Judg of all Controversies? Yet further, the Decree runs not in *Peters* name as now it doth in the Popes name, but in all their names; *Vers. 23. The Apostles and Elders, and Brethren, send greeting unto the Brethren which are of the Gentiles in Antioch, and Syria, and Cilicia*; and *vers. 28. it seemed good to the holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burthen than these necessary things*; and *Act. 16. 4. They delivered them the Decrees for to keep, that were ordained by the Apostles and Elders that were at Jerusalem.* It is ridiculous and incredible to think that there should not in all this story be one word of *Peters* preheminence, if he were at that time what they vainly pretend him to be, the Supream Head of the whole Church, and the Infallible Judg of all Controversies.

Another place of Scripture no less evident is the second Chapter of Saint *Pauls* Epistle to the *Galatians*, where there are divers remarkable passages; *vers. 7. The Gospel of the Uncircumcision was committed to me* (saith St. *Paul*) *as the Gospel of the Circumcision was committed to Peter.* How? what strange news is this? I thought all the Gospel of Christ, whether

whether Circumcision or Uncircumcision had been committed to *Peter*, and not any to *Paul*, but in subordination to *Peter*, so says the Pope, so say the Papists at this day: Circumcision and Uncircumcision, Jews and Gentiles, all committed to *Peter*; this is a new discovery! Saint *Paul* though rapt up into the Third Heaven, he knew nothing of this: Peradventure whilest he was in Heaven, the decree for *Peters* Supremacy and Infallibility was enacted upon earth, and so he lost the knowledg of that Mystery. Howsoever he found nothing of it in Heaven, and we can find nothing of it upon Earth, and therefore it must needs come from a third place, and what that is, I leave to you to judg. He adds further, *vers. 9. When James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars* (he speaks of them all alike, all Rocks and Pillars) *perceived the grace which was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship*; and *vers. 11. When Peter came to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed.* What? the Infallible Judg to be blamed? this is nonsence: the Infallible Judg to seduce and mislead them that followed him? This he did, says Saint *Paul:* And therefore it is a very nonsensical opinion to think that at this time he owned *Peter* to be the Supream and Infallible Judg of all Controversies. Observe further, how sleightly he speaks of all the Apostles, and that promiscuously, without any reservation for *Peter*, vers. *6. Those who seemed to be somewhat, whatsoever they were it maketh no matter to me (God accepteth no mans person) for they, who seemed to be somewhat in conference added nothing to me: Peter* is no more to me than another man, nor than *James*, nor *John*, and all the Apostles. I received the Gospel immediately from Christ, and *He that wrought effectually in Peter to the Apostleship of the Circumcision, the same was mighty in me towards the Gentiles, vers.* 8. Can any man living think, that considers what he believes, that the Apostle would have spoke thus, and that all the Apostles would have dealt thus, if they had known and believed, that *Peter* had been at this instant the Supream Infallible Judg, to whom all were obliged to submit. But further, if all that is said concerning *Peter* had been true, and if the alledged Promises did indeed belong to *Peter*, and did make him an Infallible Judg of all Controversies; yet what is this to the Pope, who is a person of a quite different character? Which that you may understand a little, I shall in brief present to you the quality of those persons, who they say, are Infallible Judges of all Controversies. I shall not mention a word out of any Protestant Author, but out of their own writings. The Popes Library-keeper, *Platina*, confesseth concerning divers of the Popes, as is notorious, that *they were, hominum portenta, monsters of men*; and elsewhere he confesseth, that *there were Eighteen Popes successively, one after another that were Magicians, and in covenant with the Devil.* Can any man living think that such persons were infallibly guided by the Spirit of God that had made a league with the Devil?

and *Genebrard*, a violent and virulent Papist, confesseth that *the Popes for a hundred and fifty years together after the Apostles were Apostates, not Apostolical*; and our country-man *Stapleton*, an eminent man amongst the Papists, saith, *I must acknowledg, I think, there were scarce any sins, except that of Heresy, of which the Popes and Bishops of* Rome *were not guilty.* And it is notoriously known that many of them were Adulterers, and many of them *Sodomites*, and many of them bloody and cruel men, and guilty of all sorts of Wickedness. I need say no more, but shall leave it to you to judg how incredible a thing it is, that persons of such a character as this, should be the Supreme and Infallible Judges of all Controversies. How can it be imagined, that such a person should be the foundation of the Church, that is not so much as a true member of the Church? Or how can that Promise; *The gates of hell shall not prevail against thee*, belong to that man that hath made a covenant with Hell it self, or that is a bondslave of the Devil? How can any infamous wicked wretch make claim to those Promises which Christ made to the holy and blessed Apostles? How can it be imagined that that mans Faith is secured, all whose other Graces are ruined and come to nothing? You shall find that Faith and a good Conscience go together; 1 *Tim.* 1. 19. *Holding faith and a good conscience, which some having put away, concerning faith have make shipwrack.* How can any mans Faith live, when all his other Graces are confessed to be dead? And you know what Saint *James* saith, *Chap.* 2. *vers.* 20. *Faith without works is dead.* How can that man pretend to be infallibly guided by the Spirit of God, that hath not the Spirit of God in him? It is expresly said of such sensual and brutish men, as many of the Popes are acknowledged to have been, that they have not the Spirit of God. We have it under the hand of one of the Apostles, *Jude vers.* 19. *Sensual, not having the spirit.* Which also appears (and it is very remarkable that it doth so) from that very Text which they bring to prove the Infallibility of Councils; *John* 14. 16, 17. *I will pray the father, and he shall give you another comforter, that he may abide with you for ever, even the spirit of truth whom the world* (that is, as is evident, the wicked men of the World) *cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him:* the World hath not the Spirit of God, because they have not seen nor known God. Now, who those men are that have not seen nor known God, you may learn from another place; 1 *John* 3. 6. *Whosoever abideth in him*, that is, in God, or in Christ, *sinneth not, whosoever sinneth hath not seen him, neither known him*; that is, whosoever doth sell himself to sin, whosoever alloweth himself in the customary practice of sin, for of such only that phrase is meant, otherwise the same Apostle says, *If we say we have no sin, we deceive our selves, and the truth is not in us*, and *There is not a just man on earth that doth good and sinneth not, Eccles.* 7. 20. But the meaning is, he that lives in a constant course of sin, this man hath not seen God, nor known

known him, and therefore hath not the Spirit of God; and therefore away with that impudent Doctrine that pretends the infallible Guidance of the Spirit, to him that hath not so much as the common Graces of the Spirit of God.

By this time I hope it sufficiently appeareth that the Doctrine of the Popes Supreme and Infallible Authority hath no foundation in Scripture; I should now proceed to shew that this Doctrine was not owned by the Ancient Church succeeding the Apostles: But because this would of it self require a large discourse, and hath been abundantly demonstrated by others, and I have elsewhere spoken something to it, I shall at present wholly forbear it. I thought to shew you that as it was not owned by the Scripture, so neither was it owned by the first and purest Churches.

For the second Particular, the Supremacy and Infallibility of Councils, separate from the Pope, it is so little owned by our English Papists, that I shall not need to spend many words about it. The places of Scripture which they alledg for it, are principally these three.

The first, *Matt.* 18. 20. *Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.* A most ridiculous proof! for all that this Text proves, is the special and gracious Presence of Christ: Christs gracious Presence is one thing, infallible Guidance is another thing; if that Presence of Christs makes all those infallible which have it, it is not only the Pope, or a General Council, but all Councils, and all assemblies of Christians are Infallible. Further this Promise is suspended upon that condition of being gathered together in Christs name, that is, by Christs command and commission, seeking his honour and glory, being guided by his Rule, and acting according to his Will; all which is included in that phrase of being *gathered in Christs name:* It is true he that doth all this is Infallible, but the question is, whether they do this; nay, it is abundantly evident they do it not.

Another place is, *John* 16. 13. *When the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth.* To that I shall need only to say this, that this Promise is made to the Apostles alone, and it is made to every Apostle. Pray observe it, it was not only made to *Peter*, but to all the Apostles, and to every Apostle: whereas one Apostle went one way, and another another way, one preached to the Jews, another to the Gentiles, God did promise that he would direct all these in Preaching the Doctrine of the Gospel, that they should be led into all necessary truths, and this was necessary to be done in laying the foundation of the Christian Church: But what is this to the Pope or General Council? He doth not say, that the Apostles shall be Infallible only when they are gathered together, but every one asunder: otherwise all those Churches which were converted by the Preaching of any single Apostle (which was the case of most Churches in the World) had no certain

and infallible foundation for their Faith. And consequently, if this Privilege be extended to the Successors of the Apostles, then not only the Pope is Infallible, but all and every other Successor of any one of the Apostles is Infallible; so that either it proves the Infallibility of divers particular persons, or else it doth not prove the Infallibility of Councils. Another place is, *Act.* 15. 28. *For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay no other burthen upon you.* A most impertinent Allegation; this is only a Declaration of the present case, and no Promise for the future. It is true, he says, this Council was guided by the Holy Ghost, and so they were, but does not say all other Councils shall. It is notoriously known that many Councils there were that were *Arrians*, and others that were Erroneous in other points; and the Papists themselves confess that many Councils have Erred, especially those Councils that have undertaken to censure and condemn the Popes, and to set up their own Authority above them. These, they say, were not led by the Holy Ghost, but (as they say expressly of the famous Council of *Carthage* for that very reason) acted by the instigation of the Devil. So that it seems all General Councils are not Infallible, but such as they please, or such as please them; the rest must seek their fortunes, and shift for themselves. As for this Council, *Act.* 15. it is confessed they were Infallible. But doth it therefore follow, that because this Council all the Members whereof were holy men, and divers of them holy Apostles, (every one of which was Infallible) were Infallibly guided by the Holy Ghost in this Controversie, that therefore a General Council, consisting sometimes (for ought appears to the contrary) wholly of wicked men without the Spirit of God, should be Infallibly guided in all Controversies? There is no man of common sense but sees an evident disparity in the case.

I know there is one thing they further pretend, that though it be true, the Pope is not Infallible of himself, nor the Council alone, yet both together are Infallible; The Decrees of the Pope confirmed by a General Council are Infallible. Two things only I shall say to this.

1. This is but a shuffling evasion against their own Consciences, because it is notoriously known, and the Popish Doctors unanimously confess it, that this supposed Infallibility is lodged either in the Pope, or in the Council; They will not allow of a mixt Infallibility, that the Pope should constitute one part, and the Council another. *Bellarmine* says, that *Infallibility does not lye partly in the Pope, and partly in the Council, but it is wholly in the Pope, and in the Council, so far and no further than they cleave to the Pope*; and says another, *Stapl. The Council adds no Infallibility to the Pope; it is he alone that is Infallible.* And on the other side, those that place the Infallibility in the Council do as expressly affirm, *It is not partly in the Pope, and partly in the Council, but wholly in the Council, and in the Pope no further than he sticks to the Council.* Which having fully proved elsewhere out of their own Authors, I shall here omit. By which

which it is evident enough, that this is only an artifice to deceive the ignorant and injudicious people, but is not satisfactory to their own Consciences.

2. If this were true, it would do them no good, because it doth not reach the present state of the Church; for at this time there is no General Council in the Church; the Pope is now the only Head of the Church amongst them; so that either the Pope alone is the Infallible Judg, or there is none at this day. If it be said, they have besides the Popes Authority, the Decrees and Writings of the Councils, that will do them no good; for they all say, there is a necessity of a living Infallible Judg, and they say of the Scripture, that it is but a dead letter, and that no Writings can determine Controversies: so that there being now no Head of the Church beside the Pope, either he is Infallible or there is none such in their Church at this day; and therefore I may conclude, that no particular person or company of men now is, or can be, the Supream Judg of the Church, to whom all Christians are bound to submit their Faith and Consciences. I shall conclude all with two practical Inferences.

1. Learn from hence what infinite cause you have to bless God that hath delivered and preserved you from Popery, and what need you have continually to pray, and to use all lawful endeavours that this Iron-yoke may never be put upon you. The Popish teachers do by their people, as the *Philistims* did by *Sampson*, put out their eyes, and make them grind in their mill. Papists must see by their Teachers eyes, and are obliged to believe whatever they teach them. I have been informed by an *English* Merchant, sometimes residing in *Spain*, that being in some Conference concerning Religion, with a *Spaniard* of note there and his intimate Acquaintance, he used these Expressions with Tears in his Eyes; "You People of *England* are happy, you have liberty to see "with your own eyes, and to examine the Doctrine delivered to you, "upon which your everlasting life depends; but says he, We dare not "say, our Souls are our own, but we are bound to believe whatever our "Teachers tell us, though it be never so unreasonable or ridiculous. It is doubtless a dreadful thing for a man to see the Inquisition on the one hand, and damnation on the other hand. Therefore let us bless God that hitherto hath delivered us, and hath prevented in some good measure the hopes and expectations of Papists. Understand I beseech you, and consider your Priviledg; We Ministers do not impose upon you, and tell you, you must believe all we say, though it would be for our interest to do so; but we say with the Apostle, *We speak unto wise men, judg ye what we say*; We commend you as St. *Paul* did the *Bereans*, *Act.* 17. for searching the Scriptures, whether these Doctrines we teach be true or no. It is a great evidence of the truth of the Protestant Doctrine, that it is not afraid of the Light, it desires nothing more than to be tried; and it is no less an evidence of the falshood of Popery, that they

they dread nothing more than the Light. You know what our Saviour ſays, *Joh.* 3. 20, 21. *Every one that doth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, leſt his deeds ſhould be reproved, but he that doth truth cometh to the light that his deeds may be made manifeſt, that they are wrought in God.* God hath given you Talents, we command you to uſe your Talents, they command you to wrap them in a napkin. God hath given you light, *The Spirit of a man is the Candle of the Lord*; we command you to ſee by that Light, they command you to hide it under a buſhel. Pity blind Papiſts, pray for them, and rejoyce in the goodneſs of God towards you, and ſee what cauſe you have to be fervent in prayer, that God may never ſuffer Popery to recover its ſtanding in theſe Kingdoms.

2. For as much as there is no perſon upon Earth that can infallibly guide you to Salvation, it concerns you to have the greater care of your own Salvation. You will ſay what ſhall we do? I ſhall only give you theſe three Directions, and ſo conclude. Do but theſe three things, and you need not be troubled that you have no Infallible Judg to ſecure you in your way.

1. Study the holy Scriptures, let the Pope forbid you to do it, it is no matter, it is ſufficient for us, that Chriſt commands you to do it, *Joh.* 5. 39. *Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life*; *ye think*, and ye think right, you muſt not take that for a term of diminution; no more than when the Apoſtle ſaith, *I think I have the ſpirit of God*, 1 Cor. 7. But the meaning is, you judg, and you judg aright in it; *Joh.* 20. 31. *Theſe things are written that you might believe, that Jeſus is the Chriſt the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name.* The Word is written, and bleſſed be God you have it before your eyes, it is not hid nor locked up from you, as amongſt the miſerable Papiſts; but the Book is open, and you may read it, and may by Gods bleſſing upon your own induſtry and the uſe of thoſe helps which his gracious Providence affords you, in competent meaſure underſtand it. I ſhall only mention that one place, and methinks the very reading of it ſhould put this diſpute quite out of doors, 2 *Tim.* 3. 14, *&c. But continue thou in the things which thou haſt learned, and haſt been aſſured of, knowing of whom thou haſt learned them, and that from a child thou haſt known the holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wiſe unto Salvation, through Faith which is in Chriſt Jeſus.*

2. Pray fervently for the Guidance of Gods Spirit; and for your encouragement know that God hath not left you without Promiſes, & thoſe much more clear than thoſe which the Papiſts produce for their *Diana* of Infallibility. In general this, *Joh.* 16. 23. *Whatſoever ye ſhall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you.* And leſt any ſhould think this Promiſe is confined to the Apoſtles, our Saviour adds, *Joh.* 17. 20, 21. *Neither pray I for theſe alone, but for them alſo which ſhall believe on me through their word. That they all may be one, &c.* Another clear and comfortable

fortable Promiſe to this purpoſe you have *Luk.* 11. 13. *If ye then being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your Children, how much more ſhall your Heavenly Father give the holy Spirit to thoſe that ask him?* Whence I may venture to draw this Concluſion, That an holy and humble Chriſtian ſincerely asking the conduct of the holy Spirit, hath better aſſurance of his Infallible Guidance in all Truths neceſſary to Salvation, than an ungodly Pope that either doth not ask it, or asks amiſs, ſeeing ſuch a perſon hath no intereſt in Chriſt, *in whom* alone *all the Promiſes are Yea and Amen*, 2 Cor. 1. 20. And therefore let no Chriſtian perplex himſelf with ſuch anxious thoughts as theſe, What ſhall I do under the various and contradictory Opinions that are amongſt us? I want wiſdom to diſcern. St. *James* tells you what you ſhould do, *Jam.* 1. 5. *If any man lack wiſdom, let him ask of God, who gives to all men* (mark that) *liberally, and upbraideth not, and it ſhall be given him.* And therefore in this caſe beg Counſel from God. There is not the weakeſt, nor the moſt ignorant creature amongſt you, but if you faithfully and diligently ſeek direction from God, you may confidently expect it. Pray to God as *David* did, *Pſal.* 25. 5. *Lead me in thy Truth, and teach me; for thou art the God of my Salvation, on thee do I wait all the day.* And *Pſal.* 43. 3. *Oh ſend out thy Light and thy Truth, let them lead me, and bring me unto thy holy hill.* And as *David* did beg this of God, ſo he promiſeth it to himſelf, and ſo may every ſincere Chriſtian, *Pſal.* 73. 24. *Thou ſhalt guide me with thy counſel, and afterwards receive me to glory.* God is the ſame God ſtill, and as able and as willing to direct you as ever he was, and as faithful in keeping his Promiſe as ever, as ready to hear as you are willing to ask. You have it under Gods hand, *Luk.* 11. 10. *Ask and you ſhall receive, ſeek and you ſhall find, knock and it ſhall be opened to you.* What need more be ſaid to encourage the Faith and the Hope of all that fear God?

3. If you would diſcern and hold faſt the Truth, love and practiſe it. The beſt way to be certainly guided into the way of Truth, is to live up to it. Of this we have evident aſſurance in that forementioned place, *Joh.* 7. 17. *If any man will do his will, he ſhall know of the Doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I ſpeak of my ſelf.* Certainly a good Conſcience is the beſt preſervative of a mans Faith; and therefore when once men put away a good Conſcience, the next news is, they make ſhipwrack of their Faith, 1 *Tim.* 1. 19. *Holding faith and a good conſcience, which ſome having put away, concerning faith have made ſhipwrack:* an eminent inſtance you have, 2 *Theſ.* 2. 10, 11, 12. *Becauſe they received not the love of the truth that they might be ſaved, for this cauſe God ſhall ſend them ſtrong deluſions, that they ſhould believe a lie, that they all might be damned who believed not the Truth, but had pleaſure in unrighteouſneſs.* A Text that needs no other Comment but the Examples of this Generation. Papiſts brag much of the many Proſelytes they have gained amongſt us. For my part I am not at all ſurprized with it. When I conſider

ſider ſuch Texts as this and the righteous and tremendous Judgments of God, I rather wonder they do not flow in to them in far greater numbers. Nor can I believe that any wiſe man will think they have any great cauſe of triumph in their Proſelytes, if he will but make a little enquiry, and get a true Character of the generality of them. He that knows their Morals will never wonder at the change of their Religion. It is no ſtrange thing if a diſſolute Proteſtant turn a zealous Papiſt; or if the righteous God ſhake thoſe out of his lap, and out of the Proteſtant Church who were but rotten members of it.

I conclude all with that excellent advice, 2 *Pet.* 3. 17, 18. *Ye therefore, beloved, ſeeing ye know theſe things before, beware leſt ye alſo being led away by the error of the wicked, fall from your own ſtedfaſtneſs, but grow in Grace, and in the knowledg of our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt.*

CHRIST

SERMON II.

Mr Richard Baxter

CHRIST, and not the POPE, Universal Head of the Church.

1 Cor. 12. 27, 28. *Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular.*
And God hath set some in the Church, first Apostles, &c.

OUR appointed Work at this time is to determine, *Whether there be such a Church of Christs Institution, as consisteth of all Christians United or Subjected to any one meer humane Head, Personal or Collective?* Or, *Whether there be any Universal Head or Governour of the whole Church on Earth, besides, and under Jesus Christ?* Which I deny. And when I have fully opened the question, I shall prove the Negative both from this Text, and several other Texts and Arguments.

Of all the Controversies between us and the Papists, this is the first and greatest: We first deny that there is any such Head: And secondly, That the Pope is such a Head.

The Papists, as knowing the impossibility of finding any fair pretence of ascribing the Internal acts of Christs Office to the Pope, are forced to distinguish, a Mediatorial Head of vital influx to the Church-Regenerate, from a *Political Governing Head* of the Church-*visible* (or Congregate). And they confess that Christ only is the first; but say, that under Christ, the Pope is, as his Vicegerent, the second: But we maintain the Negative as to both: And if there be no such Head, there is no Church that is so Headed. Two things in this word are meant in our denial. First, There is no such *Constitutive Head*, who is to the Universal Church a Constitutive, Essential part; as is a King in a Kingdom, a Master in a Family, and the *Pars Imperans*, in every Political Society. Secondly, There is no such *Governing Head*, having *Power* and *Obligation* to make Universal Laws, and to judg and Execute Universally.

There are three ways of Divine Institution which we here exclude. First, God hath instituted no such Head or Church by the Law of Nature. Secondly, Nor by Christ himself, immediately determining it in his

humane Nature on earth. Thirdly, Nor by the Revelation or determination of his Spirit in his Apostles or any other Authorized and Infallible Inspired persons: And besides these three, we know no other sort of Institution of God, to come into question.

Our question medleth not with the Heads or Governours of Kingdoms, nor of particular Churches; but only of the Universal Church.

Arg. 1. From Nature, common Reason and Experience, *a non posse, ad non esse:* No mortal man, or Collective body of men, is capable of being a Constitutive and Governing-Head of all the Church on Earth: Therefore there is no such Head.

First, No single person is capable of it. To prove which, consider but, 1. *What a Man is.* 2. What such a man would have to do.

First, A Man is a poor finite creature, confined to one place at once, not able to compass the Earth, nor know all its Countreys, much less Inhabitants: Not able to take notice of all the actions of the sons of men throughout the World; nor to receive such satisfactory information concerning them, as may inable him to judg them justly: Nor is he capable of taking coguisance of one of many Millions of Causes that would belong to such a Judg. And Man is a poor Worm, unable to procure any due execution of Universal Laws, and to repress the Rebellion of Resisters; and to defend the Church against its enemies. And man is so bad a creature, that he that is tried in so great a work as the Government of all the World, and tried by so great temptations as must needs arise in such an undertaking, will but become (according to the course of ordinary changes) the worst, and so the most odious of men: So that it is a wonder that Man should become so ignorant, as to think that any one mortal Man is capable of Ruling all the World, or all the Christians in the World.

Secondly, But consider what such a Head must have to do, and there will remain no difficulty in the Case. 1. He that undertaketh the Universal Government, undertaketh to make Universal Laws, and to exercise Supream Power in Judging and Executing according to those Laws. And he that maketh Universal Laws in things unchangeable, must suppose that Christ hath not done it himself already, which is false: And in things changeable, he must be sufficiently acquainted with the state of all the Nations in the World, and the different Cases which require diversification both as to Time and Place: which a Man of many Thousand miles distance is uncapable of.

And as to Judgment and Execution. 1. As to Persons, it is to be exercised upon individuals. 2. As to Causes; it is 1. Either Judging who is fit or unfit for the Sacred Ministry, as to Ordination; or 2. Who is fit or unfit for Christian Communion. And that in respect, 1. To Knowledg and Faith, or Ignorance, Unbelief or Heresie; Or 2. To a Pious and Honest, or a Criminal Conversation.

First,

First, Kingdoms or Cities are not either to be taken into, or cast out of that Church of Christ, for the *Faith* or the *Faults* of any part of them. Baptism belongeth to Individuals; and to Cities and Kingdoms no otherwise than as consisting of such Individuals: It is the Faithful and their Seed that are to be baptized; God never Authorized any to baptize Kingdoms or Cities because the King or Magistrates believed.

And the same must be said of Excommunications; Kingdoms or Cities are not to be Unchurched, or Interdicted Gods worship, because of the sin of Kings and Magistrates: (Though such inhumane and unchristian kind of Discipline hath (upon the *Venetians* and many other Countries) been exercised by the Pope); God saith, that the Soul that sinneth shall dye, and not the Son for the Fathers sin, which he is not guilty of.

Secondly, And if this be so, it is easie to discern whether one Man can so Govern all the World. 1. He that ordaineth Ministers, must try them, that he may truly judg of their sufficiency. 2. He that baptizeth the Adult, must try their Knowledg and Faith, that he may truly judg of their Capacity. 3. He that will justly judg any accused of Heresie or wicked living, must hear the Witnesses, and hear the Person, and understand the circumstances of the Cause: And before he Excommunicate any, he must not only know him to be Criminal, but also Impenitent; and therefore must with Evidence, Love and Patience, endeavour first to bring him to Repentance. The like knowledg is necessary to a just Absolution. And what can one Man do in any of this, for all the World?

Object. *He can do it* per alios, *though not* per se: *He can send forth men to do it. The King cannot Govern his Kingdom by himself only, without Officers; but by them he can.*

Answ. 1. What other men do, he doth not: To say he doth it *per alios*, is but a deceitful phrase, and maketh not their work to be his. That which he doth, is not to Preach, and Baptize, and Excommunicate, and Absolve *by them*, but to bid them do it, or license them; yet if he sent them all to do it as his Servants Authorized by him to do it in his name and stead, it might be called morally his Act: but it is not so. The Office of a Bishop or Presbyter, is of Divine Institution, and their work described by the Word of God; and the Office and Work is their own; and they themselves are accountable for it to their chief Pastor, Jesus Christ. 2. The work of an Ecclesiastick Pastor is personal, even the exercise of his own skill, and not only the commanding of another to do it. If setting others on the work were all that's necessary, there needed no Bishop or Pastor to be such a Head; a Prince were fitter: *David* and *Solomon* could command the Priests and

Levites to do their Office, and could place and displace them; and so many Christian Kings: But as it is not the proper Office of a Physician, Surgeon, Printer, Architect, *&c.* to License Physicians, Surgeons, Printers, *&c.* or to set them on work; so neither of a Bishop or Pastor to license or command such: And for Ordination, it may be done without a Pope; or else how is the Pope ordained or consecrated himself. 3. The Office of the Apostles was not only to send other men to convert the World, and settle the Churches, and govern them; but first to labour in all this themselves, and then to ordain others to go along with them as their helpers, and to govern the particular Churches; which is not the same thing, as only to set other men on work. 4. A Kings Office consisteth so much in Power, to appoint Officers under him to their several Provinces and Works, as that therein it greatly differeth from a Pastors, which is like to a Physicians, or a Philosophers, and more consisteth in the exercise of personal skill and oversight. 5. But if all this hitherto said were nothing, it is most certain that no King is capable of governing all the World: And if the Pastoral Office required no more personal skill and exercise thereof than the Regal; yet all that would follow were but this, that as a King by himself and his Officers, can govern a Kingdom, but not all the World, so is it to be said of any Pastor; though indeed the latter is much less possible.

The Impossibilities are notorious at this day. 1. The Pope doth not so much as know a very great part of the World, what Inhabitants it hath, or of what Religion. 2. Much of the World is so remote from him that his Messengers must be many years in going, and all informations as long in being sent to him. 3. The passage is so hazardous and difficult that they are not likely by Sea and Land to escape all the dangers in the way. 4. Many Princes Countries must be past through that are enemies to Christians, and in frequent Wars with us, and one another, and therefore will not suffer such passage and intercourse as the Government of the remotest parts require. 5. There are many Countries that understand no Language which the Popes Emissaries can speak. 6. There are many Christian Countries at this day which the Pope lately was not known to, nor ever so much as required their Subjection to him, by reason of their incapacity of Converse. When *Oviedo* would have made the *Abassins* believe that Subjection to the Pope was necessary to their Salvation, the Emperours Mother posed him by that Question, *Why God nor the Pope ever told them so till now, and why they never before heard of the Popes claim?* To which the poor man had no better an answer to give, Than that inaccessibleness and distance hindered it, as *Godignus* himself reciteth the Discourse. Which is no less than a plain confession of what I am proving, that no one man is capable of governing all the World: When so great an Empire as that of *Abassia* (especially in its former grandeur) was so far out of the

Papal

Papal reach, as that for so many hundred years he could never so much as know them, and send a Governour to them, nor any Messengers to claim their Obedience; no wonder if much more of the World be further out of the reach of his Notice and Jurisdiction.

Arg. 1. And as no single natural Person, so much more no *Collective Person* or Company is capable to be an Universal Governour. For all the foresaid difficulties will be yet greater to them, than to one. There is none but an Universal Council that can be supposed to make such a Claim; which Council must be *one Civil Person*, or Collective, and therefore be in one place, and manage this Government by Consent: But 1. That place where they meet will be as distant from the Antipodes as *Rome* is, and they will have as far to send and receive information. 2. The collecting of a true Universal Council, as I shall shew anon, is not only difficult, but never to be done. 3. One man may do more in a day, than a Parliament, much more a Council of all the Christian World, can do in many Days or Weeks; there are so many to speak, debate, and to receive satisfaction. 4. And feuds and disagreements will be yet a greater hinderance: So that where there is a Natural Incapacity, there can be no Universal Governour; But both Pope and Council have a Natural Incapacity: Therefore neither of them can be an Universal Governour.

Arg. 2. From the silence of the Creed and Scripture concerning such an Universal Head: If Christ had instituted any Vicarious, Universal Governour, and consequently a Church so constituted, it would have been plainly revealed in the Creed, or Sacred Scriptures: But there is no such thing plainly revealed (nor darkly neither) in the Creed or Sacred Scriptures. Therefore there was no such instituted by Christ.

The Major is proved, in that they commonly confess that all Fundamentals or points of common necessity are plainly revealed in the Creed, or Sacred Scriptures; and they assert that an Universal Governour, and a Church so constituted, is a Fundamental, and a point of common necessity to be believed: Therefore if Christ had instituted any such, it must needs have been in the Creed, or Scriptures. No man can imagine that if the rest of the matters of Divine Faith must themselves be received from the believed Authority of such a Head or Church, Christ would not plainly make known the Authority of such a Head and Church: But this is the foundation of the Papists Faith.

And that there is no such thing contained in the Creed or Sacred Scriptures, the Impartial reading of them is enough to prove: The Creed mentioneth the Holy Catholick and Apostolick Church as one; but saith not a word of *Rome*, or the Pope, or a Council, or any Universal Governour of this Church, besides Jesus Christ.

The Sacred Scriptures mention no such neither; it is only *Peter* that is pretended by the Papists to be there endued with such a Power. But 1. There is no word that speaks such a thing, the confutation of their

vain

vain Collections, from *Tu es Petrus, &c.* and *Pasce oves meas, &c.* I have made elsewhere, and in this short Exercitation neither need nor may recite it.

2. It belongeth to the Universal Governour to make Universal Laws for the Church; but no Scripture tells us of any more that *Peter* did in this Legislation, than *James* or *Paul*, or other Apostles.

3. It belongeth to the Universal Governour to give Authority to all the rest, and to settle all Inferiour Orders and Officers; but no Scripture mentioneth any such thing of *Peter*, but the contrary, *viz.* Deacons were instituted by the Apostles jointly; none of the rest of the Twelve received his Power from *Peter*; *Paul* took *Silas*, and *Barnabas* took *Mark* with him, and *Paul* made *Timothy*, *Titus*, and others Evangelists without *Peter*, or any Authority received from him; and the Apostles ordained Elders in every Church which they planted without *Peter*, *Act.* 14.23. *Tit.* 1.5, *&c.*

Obj. *They had their power from Christ before he ascended, and so needed not receive it from Peter.*

Ans. Either *Peter* was made the Universal Governour before Christs Ascension or not; if not, then Christ personally setled no such Monarchy; yea, then he setled contrarily an Aristocracy, or equality of Power in many, that is, in all the Apostles; and is it credible that he setled one form of Government at first, and changed it so quickly after? And then the Churches were after Christ's Ascension planted and setled by such as had no Power from *Peter*, and so the Succession is not from him as the Head. And then all the Texts pretended by them (as *Pasce oves, &c.*) are by them forsaken. But if *Peter* was made Monarch before Christs Ascension then the other Apostles must before be under Christ and him, and as the Church had two Heads at once, a Prime and a Vicarious, so the rest must have their Power from both. At least after Christs Ascension all the Apostles would fall under the Government of *Peter*, and so from thence must hold their Power from him, which they never did.

4. It belongeth to the Universal Governour to be the known declared Center of the Churches common Unity; to whom accordingly in case of Divisions they should have recourse throughout all the World. But it was not so concerning *Peter*; We read of many sad Contentions, in the Churches of *Corinth*, *Galatia*, *Colosse*, *&c.* yea of *Rome* it self, *Rom.* 14. *&* 15. and many sad Heresies, Crimes and Breaches in the Seven *Asian* Churches, *Rev.* 2. *&* 3. and yet not a word to refer them to *Peter* for their healing, nor one reproof for their rebellion against him as Universal Governour, nor one perswasion to unite all in him! Nay he himself, who 2 *Pet.* 2. doth write sharply against Heresies, never mentioneth any such remedy.

5. And

5. And it belongeth to the Universal Head and Governour to rebuke all culpable Inferiours, and to receive appeals in cases of difficulty. But none of all this is said of *Peter*, but contrarily that *Paul* withstood him to the face, because he walked not uprightly, and was to be blamed, *Gal.* 2. so that the case in Scripture is plain against them.

Arg. 3. From the contrary Assertions in the Holy Scriptures. The Scriptures are not only silent as to the Institution of any such Universal Governour or Church, but they speak against it: Therefore there was no such Institution of Christ.

And here I must come up to my Text, and from it and others bring in several Scripture-Arguments.

Note here 1. That the Unity of the Church, and the nature and reasons of it, are most largely and expressly handled in this Chapter. 2. That this Church is called the Body of Christ, but not of *Peter* or the Pope; and that its Unity is placed in *one Spirit*, *one Lord*, and *one God*, *Vers.* 5, 6, 7; 11, 12, 13. and not in one Vicarious Head. 3. That all Believers are numbred with the Members, even Apostles themselves expressly, as contradistinct from the Head in whom they are united. Apostles are called here, Members in particular, set by God in the Church, even the *first* rank of *Members*, and Prophets next. If *Peter* then was the Universal Head, it was not as an Apostle; for the Apostles were but the noblest Members in particular.

Arg. I. If Christ be here described as the only Head, and Apostles but as particular Members, then no Apostle was an Universal Governour or Head: But the Antecedent is plain in the Text, *&c.*

And indeed *Bellarmine* is forced to maintain that the Pope succeedeth not *Peter* as an Apostle, but as the Vicarious Head of the Church; by which he confesseth that *Peter* was not such a Head as an Apostle. But *Paul* here describing the whole Body, mentioneth no part but Christ the Head, and Apostles and others variously gifted and placed, as particular Members. So that here is no Office above Apostolical in which the Pope can succeed *Peter*.

Arg. II. The same evidence is visible in *Ephes.* 4. where *Paul* vehemently endeavouring the *Ephesians* Unity, reckoneth up only these seven Necessaries in which it must be founded: 1. *One Body* (of Christ). 2. *One Spirit*. 3. *One Hope of our Calling* (Grace and Glory). 4. *One Lord* (Jesus Christ). 5. *One Faith* (the Belief of the Gospel). 6. *One Baptism* (and Baptismal Covenant). 7. *One God and Father of all, above all, through all and in all*); vers. 3, 4, 5, 6. And in all the Members who must in these seven be united, he placeth diversity, and numbereth Apostles, Prophets and Pastors with the rest, as being but particular Members of the Body. And then he describeth the Body that is thus to be united, the ends and benefits of their concord, and the subordinate means,

means, to *verſ.* 16. In which he calleth them the Body of Chriſt (only and not of the Pope) which muſt come to a perfect man, in the Unity of Faith and Knowledg of Chriſt, and not be toſſed with every wind of Doctrine, but grow up in him in all things which is the Head, Chriſt: *From whom the whole body fitly conjoyned and compacted* (not by another Head but) *by that which every joynt ſupplyeth, according to the effectual working in the meaſure of every part, maketh increaſe of the body to the edifying of it ſelf in love.* There could never have been an opener door, for *Paul* to have brought in the mention of an Univerſal Vicarious Governour at, if he had known of any ſuch; than the occaſions and Subject here in hand. But here is ſtill none but Chriſt the Head, and Apoſtles and others as the particular Members.

Arg. III. Yet more expreſly in 1 *Cor.* 1.3. When the *Corinthians* were inclined to factions; ſome would have United in *Paul*, and ſome in *Apollo*, and ſome in *Cephas* or *Peter*, and ſome would have appropriated Chriſt to themſelves. And how doth *Paul* ſeek to heal this Schiſm? Not by telling them that indeed they muſt all Unite in *Peter* as the Univerſal Head or Monarch; but that *Chriſt is not divided* (and therefore he muſt be their common Center) and that the reſt were but his Miniſters by whom they believed, and were not crucified for them, nor were they Baptized into their name; and that they ſhewed themſelves Carnal by theſe contentions, in ſetting up one above another, when *Paul*, *Apollo*, and *Cephas*, were alike theirs, and Miniſters of Chriſt, and Stewards of his Myſteries; *Cap.* 3.3;22. & 4.1. So that here *Peter* is not only not mentioned as the Head and Center of Church-Unity, when his Name was in queſtion, and the Caſe required it, (had it been true) but alſo expreſly and by Name excluded from any ſuch Office, and thoſe ſharply taxed that would ſo have thought of him, nay, that thought yet lower of him; for indeed there is no probability that any of the *Corinthians* dreamt of his Univerſal Government, but only ſome preferred him as a more excellent Teacher before all others, in a ſiding way.

Arg. IV. When *Peter* himſelf inſtructeth the Paſtors of the Church in their duty, 1. He taketh no higher title to himſelf than an Apoſtle and Servant of Jeſus Chriſt, and an Elder, and a Witneſs of his ſufferings, and a partaker of the Glory that ſhall be revealed. 2. And he tells them that they muſt not overſee the flock as Lords, but as Examples; which is inconſiſtent with their opinion, who take his Univerſal Government, to be eſſential to the Church, and neceſſary to Salvation to be believed.

Arg. V. In *Matt.* 20. We find it put by way of petition to Chriſt, to determine who ſhould be greateſt; *viz.* that *James* and *John* might be

be next him in his Kingdom; and *Peter* with the rest of the Ten were offended at it: yet Christ is so far from telling them that either they, or *Peter* shall have such honour, that he contrarily concludeth; *vers.* 25. &c. *Ye know that the Princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them; but it shall not be so among you: But whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant.* Even in this, not telling them who shall be the Man, but leaving it to them by humility and service to merit all that preeminence which he alloweth of.

Arg. 4. The Fourth chief Argument is fetcht from the Non-consistence of such an Universal Head with the Office and Prerogative of Christ.

To have Instituted an Universal Head and Governour, would have been the making of another Christ, or at least the communicating of part of the Essence of Christs Office and Prerogative; But Christ did never make another Christ, nor communicate any part of the Essence of his Office or Prerogative: Therefore Christ did never Institute an Universal Head and Governour.

The first Proposition is proved by the true definition or description of Christs Office, which containeth his Universal Kingdom, as well as his Universal Propriety and Priesthood. That Christ is the *Owner* and the Ruler of all, is believed by all that believe him to be the Christ; *For this end, he both dyed, rose, and revived, that he might be Lord of the dead and of the living, Rom.* 14. 9. And the Universality of some parts of his Priestly Office are acknowledged; and of the rest, as to those who are capable of the Benefits. He is the *Owner* of all the World: And he is the Ruler of all, *de jure, & de facto,* in divers manners and degrees, though only the faithful obey him to Salvation: And his Sacrifice had not only a sufficiency for all, but also effectually procured the common Grace and Benefits which are actually given to all. And 1. It is confessed by all sober persons, that Christ hath not given to any under him an Universal Propriety. If any Parasite of the Pope so talk, the rest dare not own it. To be the Lord or Owner of all *Things* and *Persons* is proper to Christ: If the Pope be his *Vicarious* Proprietary, Kings and Persons are at his will and mercy, and he need not to be beholden to any Prince for Tribute; for all Lands and Monies in the World are his: But this is the proper Prerogative of Christ. And there is no Mediator that offereth himself a Sacrifice for the sins of the World, or meriteth for all men, or all believers, but Jesus Christ.

The *Minor* is undeniable: Christ by vertue of his Universal Power, hath communicated a Ministerial Limited Subordinate Power to men, over several parts of his Church or Kingdom, but not Universal over

all; which needeth no other proof, than to know that *Authority* and *Obligation* concur in constituting every such Office: And if any one Apostle had been *Obliged* to Rule, yea, or to Teach all the World, he had been obliged to an impossibility. Therefore even the Apostles all together had but an *Indefinite* obligation, and not an Universal as to all the World; no, nor to all the Churches: For if *e.g. Philip* their Deacon, or his converted Eunuch, or *Joseph*, or *Nathaniel*, or any other Preacher did convert any Countrey, or gather any Churches far off from the reach of any Apostle, no Apostle was bound to Teach or Rule that Church; much less any one of them to Teach and Rule all the World.

And 1. If Christ have not made an Universal Sub-proprietor, it's not like that he hath made an Universal Rector. 2. If Christ have not made an Universal Teacher, 3. Nor an Universal Priest; by the same Reason we may conclude, that the Universal Kingdom is incommunicable. 4. And as to the Kingdom it self, 1. The Universal Legislation is already performed by Christ, and therefore not left to Man. 2. *Universal*, Forcible Government is committed to no Man: All Power in Heaven and Earth is given to Christ; and he committeth the Sword to Kings and Magistrates, and the Word to Ministers with the Keys of the Church; But Christ never made an Universal King or Magistrate under him, to Govern all the World by the Sword: Therefore we as well may conclude, that he never made an Universal Pastor, or Church-Monarch; one part of his proper Kingdom being no more communicable than the other. 3. And Universal *Protection*, which is another kind of Kingly Office, is not communicated to any. The Pope cannot Protect all the World, or all the Church; so that all the rest of Christs Office, being as to the *Universality* confessed incommunicable, it will follow that Government must be so also: I say, As to *Universality*, as foreseeing that they will object, that it is Incommunicable as to *Primacy* of *Power*, but not as to *Universality*; which therefore I have proved, though in this strait I must not stand to Answer their frivolous Objections.

And here you may perceive, why Protestants say that the Pope is Antichrist, even because he traiterously usurpeth, and arrogateth, that which is Essential to Christs own Office, by making himself an Universal Head to Christs Body, and Governour of his Kingdom, on a false pretence of Christs delegation.

Object. *A King may make a Vice-King, or Lieutenant, without parting with any of his Royalty or Prerogatives.*

Answ. 1. It is not the *Name* of a *Viceroy*, but the Thing that is in question. A King may call a Subject his Viceroy, and may make him his chief Magistrate over some part of his Empire that is distant from him,

him, yea or over the whole: But if he give him the absolute *Legislative*, and *Judicial* Power over all his Kingdom, he parteth with his Royalty, and maketh that man King. 2. But suppose it were otherwise, the reason of the difference in the case is evident. A King is but a Man, and so is his Viceroy, and one is as capable of Ruling as the other. But Universal Government is somewhat above the capacity of any meer Man, and none but God and our Redeemer is capable of it: Therefore if Christ will make an Universal Head and Governour of the World or Church, he must make him another Christ, or a God; or else he doth not make him capable.

Arg. 5. A *negatione effectus ad negationem effectionis.* There never was such an Universal Vicarious Head of Christs Body: Therefore he never instituted such.

Nothing but the Antecedent here needs proof.

I shall consider (for the proof of the Antecedent) 1. Of the Church in the time when the Scripture was written: 2. And of the Church till the days of *Constantine*: 3. And of the Church till the Usurpation of the Title of Universal Head: 4. And of the Church since then to this day.

1. In Scripture-times I have proved already, that neither *Peter* nor any other did govern the Universal Church, in Ordination, Legislation, Judgment, Appeals, &c.

2. Till *Constantines* time there is not the least probability of any such thing in Church-History; which I will not be beholden to any man to grant me who is acquainted with the Records of Antiquity; nor do I fear a denial from any thing but Faction, or blind Partiality, such as *Baronius*, and other Flatterers of the Pope were byassed by. For whereas the chief Claim of the Pope is from his Presidency in Councils, till *Constantines* days there never was such a thing as a General Council in the World (unless you will call Christs Family and Apostles such). And he that can prove the Pope to have been till then the Governour of all the World, or all the Christians in the World, will fetch his proofs (neither from Scripture nor true History, but) from somewhat unknown to other Mortals.

3. And were Men but Impartial in the studying of Church-History, I would not be beholden to any Man readily to acknowledg all that follows: 1. That *Constantine* and his Successors were far from being Rulers of all the World; having but one Empire, which though great, the Maps will tell you was small in comparison of all the Earth. 2. That the Bishop of *Rome* was to the Empire but as the Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury* is to *England*; a Bishop who by that Emperour had a Primacy given him in his Empire: For what Power had he to settle a Head to the rest of the World? 3. That whereas his Presidency in General Councils was his chief pretence for his Universal Power, even that Presidency was unconstant, and varied as the Emperour pleased. 4. That

those General Councils were called General but in reference to one Principality or Empire, (as the *Scots* called their Assemblies *General*) and were no Universal Councils representing all the Churches in the World. For 1. They were called long by the Emperour; And what Power had the *Roman* Emperour to call together the Bishops of all the World? 2. The Subscriptions of the Bishops as recorded even in *Binius*, *Surius*, *Nicolinus*, *Crab*, will satisfie any man that doth not by Faction hinder his own satisfaction: And though the name of one *Johannes Persidis* in the Council of *Nice*, and some such Instances in others, seem great Objections to some Men, I let them go, as knowing that there is no end of disputing with those Men that can make a Mountain of an Atome. There was a City called *Persis*; and it was then usual to place a Bishop at the Borders of *Persia*, *Scythia*, *&c.* and to call him by the Title of the Neighbour Country which he was desired to take care of. I have oft enough in other Writings proved, that the Councils were but Imperial, (supposing that some few under Pagans, that affected the Countenance of the *Roman* Greatness, who were Neighbours, did rarely joyn themselves): And that *Reynerius* confesseth, that the *Armenians* and other Churches converted by the Apostles, were not under the Bishop of *Rome*: And that *Theodoret* giveth the Reason why the Bishop of *Nisibis* was at the Council of *Nice*, because *Nisibis* was then under the *Roman* Empire: And that the *Abassines*, the *Persians*, *Indians*, outer *Armenians*, and many other Countries of Christians without the Empire, were not represented in the Councils, nor ever subjected themselves to the Pope of *Rome*.

4. And even since the days of *Boniface* who obtained of *Phocas* the Name of Universal Bishop, the Christian World was never under him. For 1. The *Greek* Church hath ever since resisted the Claim. 2. The said *Abassines*, *Armenians*, *Indians*, and many others never subjected themselves to him. 3. He hath captivated his professed Subjects by so much cruel force, as that he is uncapable of knowing who are his real Subjects by consent: And we have by experience reason to think, that in all Popish Countries it is not one of many that is a Papist understandingly, and at the heart, but most either know not what Popery is, or silently go on with their Neighbours to avoid the obloquy and suffering, which else they must undergo. 4. Dr. *Field* (of the *Church*); and Bishop *Morton* (in his *Apolog.*) have fully proved; That till *Luthers* time, abundance of the Doctors of each Age, though they renounced not the *Roman* Communion, were against their Opinions; and that there is scarce any Doctrine of the Protestants, which men of their own Communion held not. All which fully shew that the Universal Church did never acknowledg or receive this pretended Universal Head. 5. To all which I may add, That all the *Greek* Church (when far larger than the *Latin*) did ever hold the Primacy in the Empire to be *Jure humano* only; which is notorious in the express words of the Council

at

at *Chalcedon*, and in that the Patriarch of *Constantinople* contended for the Primacy, which he could never have done had he taken it to be of Gods Institution: For *Constantinople* being comparatively a novel Church, had no pretence to a Primacy as *Jure Divino*. All which I have further proved elsewhere.

Of all the Arguments brought for the Popes Universal Government I know but Two, that to a considering Man are worthy a Confutation.

The first is from pretended Possession: Christ ruleth his Church not only Preceptively but Eventually *de facto*, according to the great design of his Office, (else he should be but a Nominal King himself;) But Christ hath *Eventually*, or *de facto* ruled his Church by the Pope and his Prelates these Thousand years at least, if not from the beginning: Therefore he Instituted this sort of Government (or else his own Regiment and Design is frustrate).

Ans. 1. As to the Major; the Church of Christ hath obedient and disobedient Professors; Good and Bad, Piety and Sin are in the Church-Visible. The Goodness and Piety, and Obedience is according to his Decree and Purpose; but so is not the Sin. And Christs own Government obtaineth its ends, in the Salvation of his Elect, and in so much restraint and order as he keepeth up among the rest. 2. Else this Argument would prove as much that Idolatry and Heathenism were better than the *Jews* Religion, before Christs Incarnation: For *Judæa* was a very little spot of the World, and *de facto* Heathenism did possess most of the rest. 3. Yea it would prove all sin to be of Gods appointment, if we might argue a *facto ad jus*.

2. But the Minor is not true: It is accounted by the best Geographers to be but about a third or fourth part of the Christian World that are Papists at this day, when the decay of the Eastern Churches, and the loss of *Nubia*, and a great part of the *Abassine* Empire, *&c.* hath much diminished it. I may therefore turn this Argument better against them, and say that Christ never did *de facto* rule his Church, or the greatest part of it by an Universal Governour, nor permit it so to be ruled: Therefore this never was his Design: Though indeed his Will *de debito* must be known by his Laws, and not by Events.

The second Argument is: Though an Universal Head be not of Divine Institution, why may not the Bishops of the Churches set up such a one over them all by consent (or Princes at least)? And why may not an Universal Church be Instituted by Man, as well as a National or Provincial Church?

Ans. 1. Is the Government of Christs Church a matter of so small moment, and is the Soveraign Head no more concerned in it, but to leave it to Men to set up what Government they will? Undoubtedly it is

is the Prerogative of the Soveraign to appoint his own Officers: And he that doth it usurpeth his Prerogative. 2. What men are they that pretend to such Power? were they themselves the Officers of Christ, in any state of Instituted Government? If not; then (1) Christ hath made no Subordinate Government; (2) Then he made no Apostles, *&c.* (3) Then he did not the part of a Soveraign; (4) Then these Men that made the new Government were no Ministers of his, nor had any Power from him to do it. But if they themselves be Christs Instituted Officers; then 1. Christ did Institute certain Officers, and consequently a state of Government. 2. Then let these Ministers of his prove if they can that ever he commissioned them to alter that state of Governmen which he first Instituted; 3. If they cannot, let them confess that it is a Trayterous Usurpation. 4. Either it is a Government Universally needful to the Church, or not: If not, why talk you of it? If yea, who made you either greater or wiser, or better than Christ? that you can find out and settle an Universal Government, which he had not the power, the wisdom or the goodness to Institute? 5. By his Instituting particular Churches, and their Overseers or Elders, and Worship and Discipline, he shewed us that he took such a Church-settlement for his own Work: And if so, what made him do it imperfectly? and how come you to be able to do it better? 6. The World hath had lamentable experience these Thirteen hundred years and more, to how ill effects Men have altered Christs Institutions, and to what proud Contentions, Schisms, Persecutions, and other Calamities, their Alterations have tended. 7. But (to speak fully to the case) we grant that as Christs Ordinances, Doctrine, Worship and Discipline, are distinguished from the meer Circumstances of them, (called the *Circa Sacra*); so when Christ hath Instituted Officers for his own Work, Men may for edification make Officers for their Work; that is, these Circumstances (such as are Church-Wardens, Sextons, Door-keepers, and many the like). But will any man of brains and Christianity hence conclude, that Men may set up an Officer for Christ, above all the Officers of his own Institution, and empowered to over-rule them all, yea and to Silence them, Suspend them, Excommunicate them, and be a Monarch over them all? If Christ would have had such a one, he was as wise and able to do it himself as any of his Ministers are. 8. And it is God that must bless the Labours of his Officers: And he hath no-where promised to bless any but his own. 9. And if Men may make the Papacy, Men may pull it down again when reason requireth it. And it will go harder with the Pope, than either pious *Gerson (de auferibilitate Papæ)*, or Learned Card. *Nic. Cusanus (de Concordia)*, do affirm, it may. 10. But if it be but by Mens consent, that we must have a Pope, let those have none that do not consent: And then most of the Christian World will be without him.

This

This Controversie about an Universal Vicarious Head and Governour, being the true sum of the difference between the Papists and Protestants, were we not now restrained, should be much larglier handled, and fuller proofs of all that we assert annexed. But our necessitated brevity shall conclude with these few Uses.

I. Learn hence to hate the Deviliſh sin of Pride, and fear it in your selves, left there should be more of it than you have yet observed: For the Pope and his Prelates, are naturally such Sons of *Adam* as our selves: And if Pride in them may rise to such a height, as to make them in this so mad, as to think poor Man hath Capacity, and Right, and Obligation to Govern all the World, or all the Christians in the World, and thereby to become the plagues of the Earth, and the troublers of all Christian States and Churches, have not we all cause to fear it in our selves? Though it have not Temptation or Advantage to work so publickly and mischievously as theirs, alas, it is the same Sin which causeth men to overvalue their own *Understandings*, their *Goodness*, or their *Greatness*: It is the same Sin which setteth some Preachers on contriving, and hunting for preferment, and others for popular applause, and which maketh men Write, and Preach, and Talk against things which they understand not, and against men better than themselves, and to destroy Love and Concord, and tear the Churches, and harden the ungodly in the contempt of all Religion; yea, and to proceed impenitently in all this, while some think that their zeal for Order and Obedience, and others, that their zeal for Truth and Godliness, will warrant them in all this. It's an old Proverb, that all men are born with a Pope in their Bellies: And he is a Conquerour, and a Saint indeed, that hath truely overcome his Pride, which conquereth many that can Preach and Talk against it: And many that cry out of Popery, and Papal pride, do too little detect, and fear, and mortifie, the same pernicious evil in themselves.

II. Learn hence to understand the Grand Difference between the Protestants and the Papists: It is not first, Whether the Pope be the Man that Christ hath made his Universal Vicar, and Governour of all the World? But first, Whether there be *any such* Instituted by Christ or not? For if they once prove that there is any such, we will confess that no other can put in so fair a claim for it as the Pope. The question is not, first, Whether the Church of *Rome* be the true Catholick Church? But first, Whether there be any such thing of Christs Institution, as an Universal Church, Headed by a Vicarious Head, under Christ? We deny the Being of such a Head, and such a Church.

III. Therefore take heed of those disputers that cry up the Catholick Church, as supposing it to have an Universal Head besides Christ (either Pope or Council) as if this must be a granted thing; and then all that we have to do with the Pope, is but to bound and moderate him in,

in his Government: These men say, We are against the abuses of the Court of *Rome*, but not against the Church of *Rome*. But that which a Protestant justly denyeth is, That there is any such Universal Head and Church at all, as the Papists do assert.

IV. And hence observe in what sence it is, that Divines say, that *Rome* is not a true Church, nor Papists as such members of the Church of Christ; we all confess that those called Papists, who practically hold the Essentials of Christianity, and truely believe in Christ the true Head, are all parts of the true Catholick Church, which hath no Head indeed but Christ. But we maintain that the Pope was never made by Christ, the Governour of the Universal Church; and that their pretended Catholick Church, consisting of the Pope as such a Head, and of his Subjects as such, is a Traiterous Combination, and no true Church of Jesus Christ: That Policy was never Instituted by him. And in this sense all Protestants are agreed, while some say that *Rome* is a true Church, and others say that it is not: They mean thus the same thing.

V. And hence you may perceive why they take the Pope to be Antichrist: Because he usurpeth part of the Prerogative and Kingdom of Christ, without his Institution, and against his Laws; by making himself the Governour of all the World or Church, he maketh him as another Christ: As he would be a Traytor to the King, who would usurp the Universal Government of his Kingdoms, as to Legislation, Judgment, and Executions, though he should falsly pretend the Kings Commission for it.

VI. Take heed of a Fleshly, and Worldly Religion. A Fleshly, and Worldly Heart, and Life, lyeth under shame, and remorse of Conscience, till the Devil bring in the defensative of a Fleshly, and Worldly Religion: For Nature, Reason and Experience tell men, that all things below are vanity, in comparison of everlasting things; and therefore the Devil hath no such way, to keep his possession of such Souls in peace, as by making them a Religion suitable to their Worldly minds and interests: And then they will sin against God as by his own Authority, and vilifie his Servants, yea, and burn them as by his own Command, and fight against Christ as by his own Commission, *& in nomine domini incipit omne malum*, as the old Proverb is, taken from the Papal Style. Religion is so excellent, and necessary, that nothing can so successfully prevail in the minds of men against it, as that which cometh in its own garb and name. What men on Earth do Satan more service than men of a Fleshly and Worldly Religion? Who by the power of Carnality, first make themselves, and next, would make others believe, that their own Worldly Interest is the true Interest of Christ, and the Catholick Church; and when they have made their own *Carnal Wills and Interest*, the means of the Churches Peace and Concord (such as they will allow it) then cry up the great names, of Government, Obe-

Obedience, Order, Unity, Concord and Peace, and cry down all that is against them, as Confusion, Rebellion, or Schism; when all signifieth no more, but that they are proud and worldly, and have got the upper ground, and so may name things to their own advantage. When Sin becometh a Religion, it conquereth the Light, and quieteth Conscience, in the most odious actions, and most malignant oppositions of the Truth. I cannot more significantly speak my sense, than in the words of our serious Poet, Mr. *George Herbert*, in his *Church Militant*, p. 188, 189, 190.

" *Sin being not able to extirpate quite*
" *The Churches here, bravely resolv'd one night*
" *To be a Church-man too and wear a Miter*, &c.

But it is too long to be Transcribed.

If the Archbishop of *Canterbury* should tell all the World, that no Man can be a true Christian, or be saved, that believeth not in him, and becometh not his obedient Subject, and should send out men to Preach this on the pretence of Unity, Obedience, and Peace; Would not all the World deride this, as a worldly presumptuous kind of Religion? Just such is Popery, which saith the same of one that the Roman Emperour made the chief Bishop in his own Principality; and now when that Empire is dissolved, claimeth the Government of all Christian Kings and People in the whole World. Is it not a wonder of stupidity; that such a Religion, is not derided, and despised by all mankind that have the use of Reason?

VII. Lastly, Take heed of hasty trusting fair pretences, when so absurd a thing, and great a mischief, as the Papal Universal Government, may have such good words to promote it, as *Unity*, *Concord*, *Obedience*, &c. And so many deceived persons to entertain it.

Quest. *What is the mischief of this pretended Headship?*

Answ. First, It constituteth a Humane Universal Church: whose name deceiveth men, and keepeth the Divine Catholick Church to many unknown.

Secondly, This Humane Church is set up above, and against the true Universal Church of Christ; and arrogateth Power to depress, abuse, and persecute the Churches that Christ hath Instituted.

Thirdly, Hereupon it introduceth a Humane Religion, which is as injurious to the Religion instituted by Christ.

Fourthly, It cheateth Millions of Souls, by making them believe that they are good Christians, because they are Subjects to the Bishop of *Rome*, which they call, being of the right Church.

Fifthly, It becometh the Grand Engine of dividing Christians, and destroying Love, and raising Bloody Persecutions, and hindering Unity which they cry up. For when Christ hath made the terms of Christian Concord to be few and easie, and such as all Christians are agreed in, Concord is hereby accordingly made easie: But when an Usurper will come and add his Forgeries, and impossible Terms, which Christians neither do, nor ever did agree in, what more effectual and pernicious art could have been used, to divide the Churches? If nothing but Allegiance to the King be required to the Concord of his Kingdoms, all Loyal Subjects would be as one: But if a Subject will step up and say, you shall also swear to me, as the Universal Viceroy, or have no Peace, when he proveth no such Power, and the Subjects take it to be Treason to be Sworn to him without the Kings command; Would not this set all the Kingdom together by the ears?

Sixthly, And then, when men are possessed with this false opinion, that all Christians must be united in subjection to the Pope, it will pervert the minds of the very lovers of Unity and Peace, and harden them in the guilt of wicked Persecution, as if it were their duty as the friends of Unity, to root out all those as enemies to it, who refuse their false and traiterous means.

Seventhly, And I may add that the poor Pope himself is hereby made the most miserable of mortal men, while he undertaketh the Pastoral charge of millions and myriads, even of many Kingdoms and Empires, which he never can nor will perform, and so must answer for betraying and deceiving all these Souls.

Quest. *But if there be no such thing as an Universal Church, Headed and Governed by a Vicarious Head under Christ, What is the true Universal Church, and what is its true Government?*

Answ. First, The Universal Church on Earth, is all Christians Headed only by Christ, as having the sole power and capacity, of Universal Legislation, Judgment, Execution, and Protection.

Secondly, The true Government is this; 1. All forcible Government by the Sword, even about matters in Religion, belongeth to Kings and Magistrates only, in their several dominions.

Secondly, The Power of the Word, and Church-Keys (to judg who shall be in the Communion of the Church) belongeth to the Bishops or Pastors of the particular Churches respectively.

Thirdly, These Bishops or Pastors being obliged to as much Concord as they can attain, are bound to hold correspondence with one another by Delegates, Letters, or Synods, as far as the End (Church-Concord) doth make necessary.

Fourthly, If they offend and abuse their Office, they are under the Government of the Magistrate, who may chastise them.

Fifthly,

Fifthly, If the Pastor be an Infidel, or Enemy, and will not do his duty, *Cyprian* long ago told us, that the people must obey God before a wicked Pastor; and as he hath no power to *force them*, so they are not bound to consent, to sin against God, or betray the Church and their own Souls, for the will or interest of unfaithful Pastors.

Sixthly, And when all is done, we must never dream of attaining in this World a perfect Unity and Peace, nor till we come where Knowledg, Love, and Holiness, are all perfect: of which, see more in my small popular Treatise called *Catholick Unity*.

SERMON III.

KINGS and EMPEROURS, not rightful Subjects to the POPE.

Mr Henry Hurst

Act. 26. 2. *I think my ſelf happy King* Agrippa, *becauſe I ſhall anſwer for my ſelf this day before thee, &c.*

THough I cannot this day aſſume to my ſelf that happineſs the Apoſtle did, that he did Apologize before a King who was expert in all the Cuſtoms of the *Jews*, verſ. 3; Yet (I do ſuppoſe) I may account my ſelf happy, that I am to Apologize for Kings and Emperours, who do know, and have aſſumed to themſelves their Royal Prerogatives granted to them from the King of Kings by whom they reign, confirmed to them by him who is ſet upon the Holy Hill of Zion; and infringed, eluded, or uſurped by a Pretended Vicegerent, whoſe Right and Reaſon in his Pretences are no greater than his Humility or Modeſty in the claim and exerciſe of his Power. Whileſt I treat of this important Affair, I hope you that are my Auditors will do me reaſon to hear me patiently; and I humbly ſubmit the Diſcourſe to thoſe ſacred Perſons whoſe cauſe needeth no more, or greater Advocates than have already appear'd in it: And if the immodeſt reſtleſneſs of incroachers do occaſion a neceſſary Apology for this Cauſe, it deſerveth a much better than now is by others deſire, not his own choice, put upon it. If there be any thing leſs becoming the greatneſs of the Cauſe, and the excellency of the Perſons, and (as I fore-

v. 8. 15. 2.

foreſee it will be) not worthy the favourable acceptance of the meaneſt Prince; yet I humbly pray the favourable interpretation, and gracious pardon of all that my own weakneſs hath rendred defective; and a condeſcending acceptance of what the ſtrength of Reaſon, the reſentment of Duty, the obligation of Oaths, the dictates of Nature, the Command of God, and a vowed Loyalty to my Great and Gracious Soveraign, have in this (ſo much his) Cauſe better performed. With this deſired candor and hoped favour I return to my Work, which lyeth in the Text I have read, becauſe in that either directly or conſequentially lieth this Theſis.

Kings and Emperours are not rightful Subjects to the Pope, neither hath he Power for pretended or real Hereſie to Excommunicate and Depoſe them, nor to Abſolve their Subjects from their Oaths of Allegiance; but even the Clergy are ſubject to Secular Princes, and their Bodies and Eſtates under their Government.

In which *Theſis* (I obſerve) *two* different ſort of *Propoſitions*, the *firſt Negative*, the *other Poſitive*; and theſe kind of Propoſitions in the Schools are differently treated, for the Poſitives are to be proved by the Opponent, the Negative to be defended by the Reſpondent; ſo ſhould *Rome* if the Pope would carry his Cauſe, prove his own Right, which he can as eaſily now as ever; and with juſt ſuch Arguments as formerly make good; whileſt *immodeſt Claims*, *forcible Uſurpations*, *enſlaved Councils*, *citations of treaſonable Decretals*, *appellations to ſeditious Canon-Law*, *blaſphemous appropriation of Omnipotency*, *ſelf-deſigning flatteries*, *and vowed obedience to the Pope againſt Nature*, *Reaſon and Religion*; Whileſt theſe are accounted good proofs, what *Romaniſts* will think the Pope an Uſurper? or his Wars againſt the Emperour Rebellion? May all Chriſtian Kings enjoy their undoubted Rights, and keep in the undiſturbed Poſſeſſion of them until ſuch Arguments of weak and ſenſleſs become ſtrong and reaſonable, his *Roman* Holineſs will ſcarce think the reverſion worth his thanks, if it be bequeath'd him, or worthy of his hope if it be promiſed him on ſuch Terms, and on better I truſt he will never have it. This Negative part of the Poſition (for reaſons kept to my ſelf) I do caſt into the latter part of my Diſcourſe, *The Poſitive Poſition*, viz. *The Clergy are ſubject to Secular Princes, and their Bodies and Eſtates under their Government*, I put in the firſt place, and ſhall firſt handle it; whence the Negative Propoſitions will as conſequences follow and take their own place. Now here it is neceſſary I

The Summary of the Popes Right, and its Proofs.

1. Explain the Terms which are here uſed, and ſtate the Theſis.
2. Confirm the Theſis ſo ſtated.
3. Diſcover the Doctrine and Doctors who avow the contrary.
4. Give you their Reaſons, and an Anſwer to them.
5. Preſent you with ſome Corollaries from the Diſcourſe.

Method of the Diſcourſe.

Sect. 1.

Who meant by Clergy in the sense of Scripture and Ecclesiastick Writers.

Sect. I. The first Term to be explained is *Clergy*, which admits of both a Scriptural sense, and an Ecclesiastical sense: in the Scripture-sense it doth lay it self out to such extent as far exceedeth the meaning of it in Ecclesiastical sense, as is evident from the use of the word κλῆρος, both in the *Old Testament, and in the *New, where it comprehendeth all the People that are in the Congregation of the Lord, thus the Laity are κλῆρος, the Inheritance of the Lord. But the favour of *Rome* is not so great toward the people, as to understand them a part of those whom they do affert exempted from the Secular Government, it were too immodest to spoil Princes of all their Subjects.* *In the Ecclesiastical sense*, as it hath been taken for many hundred years in all sort of Writers, *in the Acts of Councils*, *in the Controversies of Disputants*, *in the Narratives of Historians*, and now in the common language of both Protestants and Papists it is restrained to men in Ecclesiastical Office by Ordination and Dedication to Divine Ministrations, called by the Church of *England*, as well as by Papists (**Sacerdotes*) Priests; to whom *Rome* vindicates a freedom from the Government of the Secular Power: In brief I understand here by Clergy, these last mentioned, and all Religious Persons, (of which multitudes are swarming under the Papacy) such as *Abbots*, *Priors*, *Monks*, *Friers*, *Jesuits*, &c. together with their Feminine Votaries, *Abbesses*, *Nuns*, &c. All these whether jointly, or a-part considered, are the persons I understand by Clergy. These are,

* Deut. 40. 20. ἔσται αὐτῷ λαὸν ἐγκλητον. And Deut. 9. 29. * οἱ δοῦλοι λαός σου καὶ κλῆρός σου, 1 Pet. 5. 3. *Cleros autem vocat non Diaconos aut Presbyteros, sed gregem qui cuique forte contigit Gubernandus.* Erasm. *in loc.* So *Vatablus* & *Grotius* explain the word.

* *Non negamus appellationem istam-----antiquam esse & ante multa Sæcula in Ecclesiâ obtinuisse.* Pp. Salm. Thes. Theol.

* *Per Sacerdotes intelligimus Novi Testamenti ministros præsertim Ecclesiæ Antistites, quos antiqui Patres, quia non civili aliquo sed sacro munere funguntur, Sacerdotes appellarunt*, Davenant. Determ. q. 15.

Sect. II. *Subject*, i.e. *Not only De facto*, because the Power of the Secular Prince is so formidable that they do not, because they dare not, deny him obedience; to which *Henry the Eighth* might well ascribe the most of the good behaviour of the Papistical Religious whom he subverted, but *de Jure* they are subjected; *God*, *Nature*, *Gratitude*, *Oaths*, *Religion*, and *necessary Constitutions of humane Laws* have subjected them. In the words of the Apostle, *Rom.* 13. 5. *Wherefore they must needs be subject*, *not only for wrath*, *but for Conscience sake.* That is (as *Grotius* well Paraphraseth it) *not only out of fear of punishment which the Law threatneth, but out of Conscience*, *because Christ hath commanded it.*

Non Solo pœnæ metu quam leges minantur sed quia Christus id præcepit. Grot. in loc.

The Subjection we speak of then is a voluntary, free, cheerful and dutiful Obedience which is due to the Civil Magistrate, and not an enforced Subjection; It is the result of Law, Conscience, and Love, not only the result of Fear and Compulsion. It is our Duty, and the Magistrates Due.

Properly and strictly all Princes are Secular.

Sect. III. *The next Term* to be explained is *Secular Princes*; where by the way note, That *Princes are properly Secular*; *their Dignity*, *Power*, *and Government* is (*quoad Originem*) in its rise *Divine*; *the Powers that are*,

are, are of God, but *(quo ad objecta)* as to the *things they do take cognisance of, they are* (though not solely, yet) *Primarily Secular.* And *(quoad externam formam)* as to the manner of pomp and state which may render the Government more Awful, 'tis and justly is, ordered and determined *(prout sapientiæ principis visum est)* as seemeth good to the wisdom of the Prince, and so is Secular. *But what through the Royal favour of some good Princes, and more through the Ambition and Usurpations of Popish Ecclesiasticks*, who have invested themselves with Principalities, and a Power equal with the Princes of this World; *It is become necessary we should distinguish Princes into Secular and Ecclesiastical:* The Secular being those Princes which we will call now Temporal and Civil; The Ecclesiastical such as the Pope, his Cardinals, and some Bishops, such as the Spiritual Electors in the Empire, *&c.* To which Inferiour Clergy do with less scruple acknowledg, and pay their ready Subjection; beside which I doubt not to assert, (and hope I shall be able to prove) they do owe a Subjection, and Obedience to the Temporal, Civil, *i.e.* Secular Prince; of which a word or two, that we may not mistake, or be mistaken. Now this term *Prince* may be *taken* either 1. In *respect to the Person*; or 2. In *respect to the Office*; In the first sense it referreth to Governments in a single Person, as in Kingdoms, in the latter it referreth to Government, managed by a State or Council, as of old in the *Roman* Commonwealth; or now in the Commonwealths of *Venice*, *Genoa*, or the *Dutch*. *Neither of these may be excluded*, where the Clergy are Subjects to a King, as in *France*, or *Spain*, they are his rightful Subjects: Where they are under a Commonwealth they are Subjects to the Secular Power; *i.e.* they owe Subjection to the Supream Civil Magistrate; as to their perpetual honour, and to the good example of all Christendom, the Illustrious Republick of *Venice* made both the proud Pope *Paul* the Fifth, and the stubborn Clergy of their State to learn and acknowledg, (διὰ τὴν ὄργην) out of fear of the Magistrates Power, when they would not (διὰ την συνείδησιν) out of sense of their own Duty. *Again*, ere I leave this, *a Prince may be considered* either with respect to Subjects that,

Whence it is that we must now distinguish into Princes Secular and Ecclesiastical.

Who these are.

Princes personally considered, or with respect to the Government.

Ecclesiasticks rightful Subjects to either Monarchs, Commonwealths, as was excellently and effectually asserted by the *Venetians* against *Paul* the 5th.

First, *Are born Subjects to* whom the Supream Magistrate is *Native Prince*; *to whom they owe fealty, and allegiance, whether they have sworn it, or not:* Their Oath strengthens a former, but createth not their first obligation to Allegiance. This is coæval with their Persons, and is Natural. Or,

Princes and Subjects Natural and perpetual.

Secondly, *Princes* may be *considered with* respect to *Subjects* that are such, *occasionally*, and *Pro tempore*, as when either necessary occasions, invite or call men into a foreign Princes Countreys, or when an arbitrary choice out of curiosity, or the like, bringeth men into a foreign Jurisdiction: The case of Merchants, Students, and Travellers, whilest they are in those Countreys, they are in Conscience bound by the just known Laws of that Land; and if they transgress those Laws,

Each may be so occasionally and temporary, as Merchants, Students and Travellers abroad.

to

to the forfeiture of State, Limb, or Life; the favour of the Prince may save the Criminal: But there is no benefit of Clergy can exempt him from the Jurisdiction of the Prince, or rescue him from the execution of the Law, by their Ministers of Justice.

Fourth Term explained, the Persons of Ecclesiasticks subject to restraints of Law.

Sect. IV. The next thing to be explained is, *How their Bodies are*, said to be, *under Government of the Civil or Secular Prince.* In short their Persons are

First, Both *liable to Arrests*, Restraints, Imprisonments, and Coercion, *as* there *shall be a just cause*, or suspicion of just cause.

Sentence of Law, against great crimes.

Secondly, And *obnoxious to the sentence of the Law, according to the nature of their offence, so* as either to lose Life, or Limb, or suffer by Stripes, or Stigmatizing, or Exile, or loss of Liberty, or any like corporal Penalty.

Common services for publick good in extream exigencies.

Thirdly, What personal services the community of the lay-Subjects are bound to do for their Countrey and their Prince, the Clergy are bound to (though usually exempt from it through the favour of their Prince) and in an urgent necessity, on the command of their Prince, they may be obliged; and ought to afford their Assistance. (As in case of an Invasion to Arm, or in an assault of a City to defend it, or in the danger of his Prince's Person to rescue him with the Labour, Courage, and Hazard of his own Life) That Clergy-man, who in a storm would not obey the Pilots order, and take his turn at the Pump, to save the Vessel, and Goods, with his own Life and the Life of others; were as unworthy of a room in the Ship, as other lading that is cast over-board to prevent a danger from its weight.

Fifth Term explained, Estates of Clergy.

Sect. V. *The Estates of the Clergy*, are next to be considered, and that in divers respects.

Hereditary Subjects as other inheritances.

First, *Their inheritances from their Fathers, do not by the Sons being a Clergy Man, become free from the common burthens*, which Authority layeth on the Publick or generality of the Subjects for defraying publick charges.

Beneficiary chargeable for publick good.

Secondly, *The Lands and Estates of their preferments* of what sort soever, *are* in like manner *chargeable, if the Magistrate judgeth it necessary* and equal: And in such case they ought to obey as readily as other men, when their Prince with advice and consent of such Counsel as can duely impose it on others, have imposed it on them.

Social may be limited, taxed, regulated. Beneficiaries may be suspended or deprived on male-administration.

Thirdly, *The Estates of Ecclesiastical Societies are under the Government* of the Secular Authority, as well as the Estates of Lay-Societies and Corporations, *to limit* their increase by gifts, as by our Statute of *Mortmain*: *To enquire and compel them*, to imploy them to *the uses for which they were given*, as by commission of charitable uses.

Fourthly, The *Estates of Clergy-men* which are (*beneficia &c.*) *given as encouragement* to them, and reward *of their labour*, and duties discharged;

are

are so under the Civil Magistrate's Government, *that he may eject and remove the negligent*, and incorrigible male-administrators in that Office, as in other cases of male-administration. Though it may be most convenient to do this by Clergy-men, as Co-adjutors in the process; yet the Authoritative determination deriveth it self from the supreme Magistrate, who as He judgeth the Offender unworthy of the Trust of such an Office, so may dispossess him of the Benefit and Estate belonging to it.

Such Estates may be conferred on others who shall discharge the trust.

Fifthly, *The Estates so taken from the one, may by the Power which justly took them away, be adjudged to another, who may better discharge the Office, and deserve the Benefice.* And in this case the Clergy-man must be subject, though possibly an error may be in the judgment passed, and no legal way be left for his relief; as fell out in the deprivation of the Protestant Ministers by Queen *Mary*.

Estates of Clergy-men, forfeitable as other mens.

Sixthly, *The Estates of Clergy-men are forfeitable on crimes of high nature, as well as other mens Estates.* Treason, of which (with or without leave from *Rome*, I say) a Clergy-man may be guilty, will forfeit his estate, and the Prince may (on conviction at least) seize it.

Sixth Term opened under Government, *de jure*, and not only *facto*.

Sect. 6. I come to the last Term to be opened, *Are under their Government*; where I do remind you, that *we speak now of matter of Right, not of matter of Fact separate from Right:* Their Persons, and Estates, ought to be under the Government of the secular Prince, as their Rightful Lord and Governour. Now Government,

Protection of Government, Clergy importunately claim.

Herein Shavelins are immodest.

First, *Is for Protection* and defence: Governours are shields of the Earth, and Heirs of restraint, a praise to them that do well, and they watch over their people as Sheepherds: whence the Poet rightly called his Prince *πόιμνα λαῶν*: And here, in this part, none do with such importunate clamors, and immodest injunctions expect a share, as the disloyal Shavelins; as if the secular Arm were framed to the Body-Politick, only to defend the Persons and Estates of Ecclesiasticks, and to offend all others.

Directive Government allow'd by some: But this allowance vanisheth when to be exercised over Popish Clergy.

Secondly, *Is Directive*; and this, some of them will indeed allow the secular Magistrate over the Clergy; but ere the Magistrate can get clear of them with this small allowance of his right, it fares with him as they say, it doth with those who receive money of Witches, or the Devil, when they come to use it, 'tis vanisht or turned into withered leaves. For,

Coercive Government, this the Popish Clergy reject.

Thirdly, *The Coercive Power* of the Civil Magistrate in Governing them, they with more Wit than good manners, or dutifulness, endeavour to wrest from the Magistrate; and when he hath parted with the Power of punishing the ill-natur'd disobedience of the Clergy, he must content himself with such a measure of observance, as may no whit infringe the Clergie's Immunities, and Rights of Holy-mother, which you may be assured their discretion will make less, than their good

Directive without Coercive Power an Engine to debase Sovereignty.

Nature would seem to allow: Indeed a Directive Power without Coercive, is an Engine to pull down the honour of a Prince, and to exalt the stubborn humour of every Male-contented Subject, a fit Project for *Rome*; and some brain-sick Millenarie, who in his hot fit dreameth of a Crown for himself on Earth. But our *Thesis* intends to Subject the Clergy of *Rome* (for our own, they readily acknowledg it, and live) in a subjection to the directive Government of the Christian Magistrate, as the Rule of their Duty, and to the Coercive Government as the just Rule of punishment for neglect of their duties.

Civil Government, though not Christian, hath both a Power Directive and Coercive over the Clergy.

Fourthly, *Where the Government secular is not Christian, yet in all just and lawful commands, the Clergy is subject to the Directive Power of it*; and *in commands unjust* and unlawful, *their Persons and Estates are under the Coercive Power*, though it should be *exercised* to the *highest degree of Persecution:* And I do not remember beside Prayers, Supplications, Patience, and Tears, any remedy left them for the last relief, but an honest, peaceable and justifiable flight from their rage, and cruelty: I added this over and above, seeing our *Thesis* speaks of subjection to Princes, who are supposed Christians, and not Heathens. Summarily then the Clergy, who by the Pope and his Law are exempt from the jurisdiction of the secular Prince in all cases, are so far from a due and rightful claim to such exemption, that in all cases Civil and Criminal, and Ecclesiastical, they are both as to their Persons and Estates, subject to the Directive and Coercive Power of the Secular Prince, be he a Christian, or Heathen Magistrate; in so much, that the Clergy owe him an Active obedience in the due and lawful exercise of his Directive Power: and in the undue exercise thereof, the Clergy as others owe him a Passive obedience, and neither may resist by force, or appeal from him to a Forreigner, to evade or null his Coercive Power.

The Summary of the Thesis stated.

The state of the Position thus laid down, I come to the second thing proposed. *viz.* To prove that the Clergy are subject to the Secular Prince, *&c.* And so

2. General Thesis proved.

St. *Paul* knew none, nor claimed any such exemption, therefore there was none for him.

1. First, *I argue from the Text*, a Majore ad Minus; *St. Paul was a Clergy-man, fitter to be trusted with such an exemption from obedience to the Secular Prince, than any of our Present Clergy:* And if any such Priviledg had been given by Christ, or had been inherent in the Office, he would have known it, claimed it, and stood on it; But St. *Paul* knew none such, stood not upon any such Priviledg: Therefore surely there is none such inherent in the Clergy, or annexed to the Clergy.

Rom. 1. 1. & Gal. 1. 1.

I think there is not much doubt to be made, whether 1. He were a Clergy-man, who had his commission from God and Christ, without the ceremonies with which men do ordain to that Office. Or 2. Whether he were concerned to plead his Priviledg if he had any; for it was a Case that toucht his Life, wherein he now was engaged. Or 3. Whether he might be bold on account of his Innocency to claim his Priviledg, since his judges determined he had done nothing worthy of Death

Acts 25. 25, & c. 26. 31.

or of Bonds, *Act.* 26. 31. Had one of our Roman Priests been thus seized, impriſoned, impleaded, and endangered; we ſhould ſoon have heard him, excepting to the juriſdiction of the Court, and appealing from an Incompetent Judg, and ſhuffling off the Proceſs with importunate clamours, that he was a Spiritual Man, and not to be call'd to account by a Temporal Power. But here you find nothing of ſuch an appeal, which cannot be imputed to the Neſcience of the Apoſtle who was inſpired by the Infallible Spirit: He would have known it if there had been any ſuch exemption, nor may it with colour of Reaſon be ſaid, he would not make uſe of his Priviledg, and that he did relax of his Right. * For 1. This would be ſuppoſed againſt all Reaſon, 1. His Life was then in queſtion. 2. He was a Man would make uſe of his Priviledges, as when he pleaded himſelf a *Roman*. 3. He ſhould have aſſerted his Priviledg, that from his teſtimony, ſucceeding Eccleſiaſticks might firmly prove theirs, though he could not have gotten clear of their hands. 4. His ſilence in the Caſe hath done the Church much wrong, which date the Immunities, ſome Centuries later than *Paul*'s time. 5. Whereas, Had he been as Zealous, and Wiſe as our *Roman* Prieſts now are; He had been more faithful to his Truſt, and we had more clearly proved our Right. Farther yet, 6. It ſeemeth little ſhort of a culpable diſſimulation, that he ſhould count, or profeſs to count himſelf happy that he was to anſwer before a Secular Prince. Nothing can be imagined more unbeſeeming him who was ſet for the defence of the Goſpel, than ſuch tame and ſoft Cowardiſe as he was guilty of, on the ſuppoſition of theſe pretended exempts. No, St. *Paul* would never have betrayed the Preachers of the Goſpel, and the Religious in all ages ſucceeding; but have at leaſt owned his Right to the Priviledg (if there had been any ſuch,) before *Feſtus*, who was under the *Roman Cæſar*, Governour of *Judea*; and ſo Judg in *Paul*'s Caſe, though *Agrippa* was but an honourable Auditor.

Anſelme queſtion'd whether an appeal to the Vicar of St. *Peter*, be a breach of Alegiance to a Terrene Prince; but ſoon let *William Rufus* know what he muſt truſt to. Refuſed to do homage to *H.* 2. & bore it out on the Authority of *Urban* and the Council of *Rome*; and of *Paſchal* 3. then *Tho. Becket*'s *Salvo ordine ſuo*, and his inflexible oppoſition to *H.* 2 who promoted him, and was his Native Lord and Sovereign ſtands on record, a witneſs of his ingratitude and rebellious humour againſt his Prince and Benefactor, who found *Tho. Becket* moſt reſolute to exempt the Clergy, though guilty of Murthers, from the judgment of the Secular Prince; that he might preſerve the uſurped Priviledges of the Church, when Reaſon, Law, and Gods own Word required juſt execution on ſuch crimes proved againſt the Clergy.

And of later years, the like bred a quarrel betwixt the Serene Republick of *Venice*, and *Paul* the fifth.

* It is *Bellarmine's* Evaſion, and *Suarez* approves it, *qui dicit Paulum non jure ſed facto Cæſarem appellaſſe.---Nam juriſdictione exemptus erat utiq; jure divino ſed quia alia ratione non poterat inimicorum inſidias Evitare.*

I conclude therefore this Argument, the Clergy of this preſent Age, and of Ages paſt are as much under the Secular Government as was St. *Paul*; But he was ſo much under it, that he accounted himſelf happy, that he might have a candid hearing before the Secular Power, and could find no Priviledg to exempt himſelf: Therefore neither have our preſent Clergy any ſuch Priviledg of exemption, and ſhould acknowledg

ledg it a happineſs to defend a juſt cauſe before an Impartial Judg, and no wrong to be adjudged to a deſerved correction for any crime condemned by the righteous Laws of their Sovereign Prince.

2. What was juſt and right, and ought to be owned by St. *Paul* a Clergy-man in the point of ſubjection to the Secular Power, that is juſt, right, & ought to be owned in the point of ſubjection to the Secular Authority now by the Clergy. This Propoſition I think will need no proof, and if it ſhould we ſhall meet with due place for it. But S. *Paul* owned this Subjection as what was juſt, right, and which ought to be. Now this Propoſition is almoſt in expreſs terms in that, *Act.* 25. 10. *I ſtand before Cæſars judgment-ſeat* *; (Which Phraſe comprehendeth the whole matter of his Subjection) *where I ought to be judged*, which paſſage excludeth any juſt exception; *I ſtand at Cæſars judgment ſeat*; *de facto, he was now before the Supream Authority Civil* *, and leſt any ſhould ſurmiſe that he did tacitely repine at it, or that we argue *a facto ad jus*; *It is added by Saint* Paul, *Where I ought to be judged.* I know ſome ſay that St. *Paul* did not this as what was of right to be done, but what was then moſt ſafe to be done, and becauſe he could not otherwiſe eſcape the hands of the *Jews*; To which I Anſwer,

*Rectè Tribunal Cæſaris vocat quod Procurator habebat nomine & mandato Cæſaris. Grot. in loc.

* As *Bellarmine* and *Suarez*, &c. of that profeſſion (who are by Profeſſion and would gladly be in Practice ſons of Belial, *i.e.* without a Superiour) affirm *Paulum non jure ſed facto Cæſarem appellaſſe.*

(1.) That the word (δεῖ) may in ſome places be ſo taken to denote what muſt in a caſe be done, without reſpect to dueneſs and right; but from this it may be ſo taken [to the Jeſuits, *Muſt be ſo taken*] is too weak an inference.

Mat. 17. 10. Ηλίαν δεῖ ἐλθεῖν, and Mat. 18. 33. οὐκ ἔδει καὶ σὲ ἐλεῆσαι;

(2) The *Greek* δεῖ in the New Teſtament doth in moſt places denote that which ought *ex debito, juſtoque ordine*, to be done, and ſo the *Muſt* is a Moral *Muſt* reſulting from the dueneſs of the thing, and that this is ſo the places cited in the Margent will prove. And yet farther we ſay,

Mat. 23. 23. ταῦτα ἔδει ποιῆσαι; and ſo *cap.* 24. 6. & 25. 26. and five times in St. *Mark.* And St. *Luke* whoſe phraſe is moſt near the pure *Greek* doth uſe it Nineteen times, of which I think not one but requireth, or beſt beareth the Interpretation, *juxta debitum & ex jure.* And when he uſeth it in the *Acts*, of 24, or 25 places, ſcarce two will bear other ſenſe than what comports with the dueneſs of Office, or comelineſs of order, or ſuch like iſſuing into a Moral *Muſt*, which is the ſame with Duty, and which is rightly expreſt by *we ought.*

1 Cor. 8. 2. οὐδέν ἔγνωκε καθὼς δεῖ γνῶναι. 1 Cor. 15. 25. δεῖ γὰρ αὐτὸν βασιλεύειν; and 2 Cor. 2. 3. ἀφ' ὧν ἔδει με χαίρειν; and c. 5. 10. ἡμᾶς φανερωθῆναι δεῖ; and Epheſ. 6. 20. ὡς δεῖ με λαλῆσαι. So Col. 4. 4. and 1 Theſ. 4. 1. πῶς δεῖ ὑμᾶς περιπατεῖν. And in his Epiſtles to *Timothy*, to *Titus*, and to the *Hebrews*, he ſtill ſo uſeth the word δεῖ of which we now do treat.

(3) Since St. *Paul* is moſt competent Judg of his own meaning, we'l view how he doth ordinarily take this δεῖ, Rom. 1. 27. *Receiving----- that recompenſe of their errour* (ἣν δεῖ) which was meet, *i.e.* juſt and due to them. And *Rom.* 8. 26. *We know not what to pray for as we ought*, Καθ' ὃ δεῖ. And *Rom.* 12. 3. *I ſay to every man-----not to think--------*

(ὑπὲρ ὃ δεῖ) *above what he ought, &c.* And so in other his Epistles his τὸ δέον, or his *Must* is what is right and ought, *ex debito & justo rerum ordine*, not what must of necessity be done. And this had so passed in the Text if it had not been so much against the Privileg of these *Roman* Clergy, who cannot now bear the plain and literal meaning of this Word of God, because they will not keep in the place to which the Word of God assigned them.

(4) The Apostle could not without sin of a high nature according to the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome* thus appeal to a Secular Judg; and now think with your selves whether to gratifie the Jesuits and Clergy of *Rome* we shall make the Apostle guilty in so high a nature, and transgressing his own rule, by doing evil that good may come of it; the judgment for which sin slumbers not.

So *Paschal* chargeth King *Henry* the first of *England*, that he gave not honour to St. *Peter*, nor to the Lord, because no Appeals came to *Rome*, i.e. Pope. *Tho. Becket* by way of Penance suspended himself from Priestly function for consenting once that Priests should be tried by Secular Power for Robberies, Murthers, &c. And he calls the Royal Decrees of the King and Parliament at *Clarendon*, for trying such crimes of the Clergy, wicked devices, *Baron. ad. Ann.* 1167. *Sect.* 26.

(5) So by this Glos we shall fairly make every resolute (not to call them obstinate) Priest that refused to own the Supream Power of his Soveraign Prince, and chose rather to die condemned according to just Laws against Traytors, and so died a stout and brave Martyr for the Truth and the Church; When *Paul* through weakness of courage, or crafty shifts betrays the just Rights of the Church, which aspersion you do as much abhor I know as becomes good Christians. Let them for ever remain Traytors to their Prince, who avow Appeals from him to an alien pretended Superiour; St. *Paul* would not out of design do it, he was too honest, he knew he could not of right do so, though his Person and Cause were Ecclesiastical, his Supream Secular Prince ought have the hearing of it, *I stand* (saith he) *at Cæsars Judgment-seat where I ought to be judged.*

Such a Saint and Martyr was *Tho. Becket* in disposition of mind, though (pity 'twas) he never was brought to legal trial for his treasonable practices. Such were *Exmew*, *Middlemore*, and also Sir *Thomas Moor*, with many others, who sacrificed their lives for a forreign usurper against their Natural Prince.

Nidigate executed for denying the Supremacy in *Hen.* 8. time, and Bishop *Fisher*,

(6) Lastly, what-ever weakness or obscurity may be in my arguing from the Text, yet I am sure the Text doth more plainly and more irrefragably assert *Cæsars* Jurisdiction over this eminent Ecclesiastick than all the Texts produced to that end do prove the exemption of the Clergy from the Civil Magistrates Judgment, or their Subjection to the Pope. I cannot renounce common sense at so easie a rate as to say Christ said thrice to *Peter*, *feed*; *&c.* therefore the Pope is the Supream Judg of Ecclesiastick Persons and Causes in the whole Church; or if I were so ealie an Arguer I should through the frailty of clear

sense

ſenſe more readily make this Heretical Concluſion, All Clergy-men inferiour to Saint *Paul* ought to own their Subjection to the Civil Authority without appeal from the Supream Power of their Prince; becauſe St. *Paul* owned it his duty, and *Cæſars* right by that Confeſſion, *I ſtand before Cæſars Judgment-ſeat where I ought to be judged.* If the *Romaniſts* be of his opinion, who when he was told that it was the Doctrine of St. *Paul*, which was aſſerted in oppoſition to his Tenet, made a quick reply, I am not of *Pauls* mind, I ſhall not take my ſelf bound to reconcile them to his opinion; if we cannot have their company herein, we ſhall not much want it whileſt we have ſuch good company as St. *Paul* and *Cæſar*. In next place,

Third Proof from Scripture.

Thirdly, I argue Clergy-men, Bodies and Eſtates are as other Subjects under the Government of the Secular Prince: Thus, *They who are included in the Community, on whom the Word of God chargeth Subjection to Princes as a duty, are under the Government of the Prince.* None can doubt this who doubt not that all is duty which the Divine Law chargeth on us in our places; But now *the Clergy are included in the Community*, which is apparent by that univerſal Propoſition of the Apoſtle in *Rom.* 13. 1. *Let every ſoul be ſubject to the higher Powers.* It is now exploded (though pretending to *Origen* as to the Author) that this is meant of the Animal, not Spiritual man, *i.e.* the Clergy-man. Time was when ſuch a gloſs paſſed current with ſome whoſe Intereſt it was the Scripture ſhould be eluded, rather than plain duty underſtood; and the aſpiring ambition of Papal Clergy nipt in the bud. Now it is clear, that the Apoſtle retaineth the *Hebrew* Dialect, *Every ſoul*, i.e. *every man.* So that either our Papal Clergy muſt diſclaim their kindred with Mankind, or elſe with their whole Family be ſubject to the Prince.

Argutiùs quam veriùs, ſaith *Eraſmus* in loc.

Omnis anima dixit pro omni homine. Eraſm. *unuſquiſque.* Vatablus. *Omnis anima pro quovis homine. In utroque Teſtamento*, Gen. 14. 21. Give me the Perſons. Angl. *Donne moi les Perſonnes*, Gall Δός μοι τούς Ἀνδρας. The *Seventy-two* ſo rendring the *Heb.* תֶּן לִי הַנֶּפֶשׁ *Animas Perſonas intelligit & homines captivos.* In the ſenſe נֶפֶשׁ is taken, *Gen.* 46. 15, 18, 22, 25, 26, & 27. *Exod.* 1. 5. *Chap.* 12. 4. *chap.* 15. 19. *Lev.* 5. 2. & 20. 6. *Numb.* 15. 25, 26. And many other places too long to be cited out of the Old Teſtament, in imitation whereof the New Teſtament ſo ſpeaketh: *Act.* 2. 41. & 43. *chap.* 3. 23. *chap.* 7. 14. *chap.* 27. 37. *Rom.* 2. 9. 1 *Peter* 3. 20.

The Perſons of the Clergy are compriſed in that (πᾶσα ψυχή) *let every ſoul*; their Eſtates in the *6. verſ. Render-----tribute to whom tribute is due.* And that you may know to whom Tribute is due, the Apoſtle telleth you, it is to him that beareth the Sword, who hath Power Civil, and Secular, *verſ.* 4.

Neither would I adviſe *Boniface* to thruſt in here ſwaggering with his two Swords; for here is not room for him, the place is deſigned for one who hath but one Sword, and who came honeſtly by it, and can give a good account thereof as he is the Miniſter of God, a terrour to thoſe that do evil, and revenger to execute wrath, not to excommunicate

nicate. In a word this place doth so peremptorily subject all Persons to the Civil Power, that I must needs though somewhat related to the Clergy, profess the Text makes equal Subjection our duty; and gratitude to the favour of our Prince maketh our Exemptions (whatever they are) at once our Priviledges above our Neighbours; and our debts to our Prince.

Fourthly, The Apostle *St.* Paul *directeth* Titus *to preach Obedience* and Subjection due to Principalities and Magistrates from Christians *without any exception of Persons*, Tit. 3. 1. Nay, if you enquire who they are that *Titus must put in mind to be subject*, you cannot refer it to other than *such* persons *as* by St. *Pauls* direction *were committed to his care and teaching*, among which you will *cap.* 1. find *the Clergy-Elders*, *ver.* 5. πρεσβύτεροι, *and Bishops*, ver. 6. ἐπίσκοποι. These are some of those whom *Titus* must put in mind to obey Magistrates. How much doth the Papal Clergy need such a Monitor to cool their fervours to their Ecclesiastical Immunities, and to kindle their decay'd zeal for Obedience to the Civil Powers. Whence I thus reason, Those that *Titus* is commanded to mind of their Obedience to Magistrates, were of right under the Government of the Magistrate; But Presbyters and Bishops, *i.e.* Clergy-men were some of those who were to be so minded by him: Therefore they are of Right under the Government of the Civil Magistrate. This is the *Theopoliteia* of St. *Paul*. But lest you should doubt he had not good will enough to the Successors and Clients of St. *Peter*, out of an old quarrel that fell out between him and St. *Peter*, when the Doctor of the Gentiles was so bold with the Prince of Apostles, that he did charge him with dissimulation, a very small and dwarfish fault in St. *Peter*, and hugely improved in his Successors. Who knows whether a spice of this old grudg were not strew'd on the injunctions of Obedience, and Subjection to the Civil Power? But what was St. *Peters* opinion in the case? Fourth Scripture Proof.

Fifthly, *St. Peter then in Epist.* 1. *chap.* 2. 13, 14, 15, 16, *verses*, doth very unluckily for his Successors and their Clergy fall into the same strain of Subjecting the Clergy as well as others; for he *doth without exception require of all Christians that they submit themselves*; i.e. their Persons, and by consequence their Estates, *to every Ordinance of Man, whether to the King, &c.* How unhappily forgetful was he of his Vicar! not one word of him and his Supremacy but all reserved intire to the King, and Inferiour Magistrates sent by the King, to whom all Christians within his Dominions are to submit themselves. Fifth Scripture Proof.

But in those days Christians were under Persecution, and it would not have been prudence to have published their Priviledges, and to have exempted the Clergy. It seems *Rome* hath long understood by unwritten Verities and Apostolical Traditions, that *Peter* thought one thing, and wrote another. But the spite is, he doth *ex cathedra*, determine this where certainly he is Infallible; since his Successors in after-

ages

ages claim the Infallible Priviledg in vertue of that firſt Grant made to *Peter*; who in practice did once what his Succeſſors do very often without impair of their Infallibility err *(in genere morum)* as to practice, but cannot in Doctrine. Well, ſure *Peter* did thus direct prudentially, and temporiſing! not ſo, his Reaſons do as it falls out aſſure us he did own it as a perpetual Doctrine and Rule; for 1. It is for the Lords ſake, *verſ.* 13. And this farther, 2. is the will of the Lord; and 3. that by ſo doing they might ſtop the mouths of the fooliſh and ignorant; who among the Heathens were ready to charge the Chriſtians without any ground given, with that, which on juſt reaſons from the ſeditious and rebellious practices of well-nigh a thouſand years conteſting with the Civil Supream Power, *Rome* hath given the fooliſh Hereticks to object againſt them; but in the words of Royal mouth, *Their Faith is faction, and their Religion Rebellion.*

Sixth Scripture Ptoof.

Now to all theſe add we in the ſixth place this Scripture-Argument; *That the Clergy whether ordinary Prieſts, or the High-Prieſts, or Prophets, once were and that* (jure) *of right ſubject to the Government of the Secular Power, and were bound to appear and give account of themſelves to the Civil Power in caſe they were accuſed and ſummoned.* So when *Ahimelech* and the Prieſts that dwelt at *Nob* were accuſed and ſummoned to give account of themſelves, and what they had done for *David*; they obey and appear before *Saul* their King, 1 *Sam.* 22. 11. Who indeed did as cruelly and tyrannically adjudg them to death as they had dutifully and readily obey'd his Summons. But now ſure if there had been any Priviledg of exemption, ſome one or other among thoſe fourſcore and five Prieſts would have known it, and pleaded it before they had been ſo unmercifully Butchered; but here is not one word of all this, no exception to the Judg as incompetent, no deprivation, and degradation from the Prieſthood, in order to reduce them to the Secular and Lay-ſtate: No delivering them by the Eccleſiaſtick State into the hands of the Secular Power; in which and ſuch like formalities the *Romiſh* Prieſt (if at any time he be ſo unbefriended and unhappy) is ſtript of his Clerical Immunities, and delivered over to the Civil Sword. It is a Riddle *Rome* will hardly unfold with dexterity, that Eighty-five Prieſts ſhould have neither knowledg of ſuch a Priviledg, nor courage to plead it for ſaving their life. I need not adviſe a Seminary Prieſt apprehended and in danger of condemnation, to ſeek a Precedent at *Nob*; he knows he ſhall loſe his labour; it is *Rome* only that ſhaves the head, and then as ſacred forbids Kings to meddle with it. Yet leſt the Tyranny of *Saul* whom the Scripture notes for this, or the meanneſs of the ſufferers ſhould any whit invalidate the inſtance, let us look a little lower where we find *Abiathar* deprived of the Prieſtly Office by *Solomon*, 1 *King.* 2. 26, 27. *Who commanded that he ſhould get him to Anathoth*, ver. 26. *and thruſt him from being Prieſt before the Lord*, ver. 27. *The chief Prieſts a-*

mong

mong the Hebrews *as they were put in by the Kings, ſo for grievous faults they might be put out, or puniſht with death by the Kings, for they were Subjects, and while the King ſat the High Prieſt ſtood.* So *Grotius* on the place.

Summi Sacerdotes apud Hebræos ut à regibus inſtituebantur; ita & ab iiſdem gravi ex culpâ deſtitui imo & morte puniri poterúnt. Erant enim ſubditi ideoq; ſedente Rege ſtabat ſummus Sacerdos: Hug. Grot. in loc. So *Grotius* took it for granted that *Abimelech* was High-Prieſt, to whom *Sadok* ſucceeded High-Priest, 1 *Chron.*29.22.

Now the Caſe is altered at *Rome*, and hath been long ſince. *Abiathar* came and (on his appearance) received ſentence of Judgment from his Soveraign: But *Sergius the firſt* was of a more unyielding mettal, and though the Emperour *Juſtinian the ſecond*, ſent for him to *Conſtantinople*, to anſwer for his Diſobedience to his Soveraign, who required him to receive the Canons of the Council of *Trullo*; yet this Pope found Partizans among his fellow-Subjects, who had leſs manners than to obey their Emperour, and more love to the Pope than to let him take ſo dangerous a Journey, and he good man would not be ſo unkind as to go againſt the will of thoſe who offered violence to the extraordinary Purſuivant that ſummoned him. Nay men of leſs Authority have taken on them to refuſe Obedience to the Summons of their Soveraign. Thus *Thomas Becket* though a greater Saint than *Sergius*, yet of a lower rank in Power refuſed to appear before King *Henry* II. and his Council of Nobles at *Notrhampton*. Nor was *Anſelm*'s carriage much more dutiful to his Soveraign King *Henry* I. to whom he refuſed to do Homage as was required and had been performed by his Predeceſſors.

An. Dom. 688.

Zacharias Pro-to Spatharius.

Anno 1164, or there abouts.

Anno 1103.

By theſe Inſtances it appears that both ordinary Prieſts, nay the High-Prieſt himſelf among the *Jews*, were under the coercive Government of the Kings of *Iſrael*, whoſe Authority the Prophets, though by extraordinary call they may with reaſon be thought in ſome reſpect above the High-Prieſt, ſubmitted unto without appeal to a Superiour, or exception to the incompetency of their Judgment. So did the Prophet ſubmit to *Aſa*, 2 *Chron.* 16. 10. and patiently did bear the haſty judgment of his angry Soveraign; no noiſe here of an appeal, no mention made of Immunities, of his Office, or Privileds of the Clergy. The Seer doth not (what once the Servant of *Philip* the *Macedonian* King did) appeal from *Aſa* a good King in a bad humour, to *Aſa* a better Judg in a good humour. How would an *Anſelm*, a *Becket*, a *Brandelino Valdemarino*, or *Scipio Saraceno* have huſt and hector'd his Prince for ſuch uſage as *Hanani* from *Aſa*, or *Jeremiah* from *Zedekiah* and his Princes, *Jer.*38.5,6. found. But thoſe great Clerks (ſo let me call the Prophets) pretended to no ſuch exemption in thoſe days, and yet *Jeremiah* had ſo ample commiſſion that the Pope deſireth no more to be granted him of Kings and Princes, and thinks this enough to ſet him above them all whileſt he offers a violence to that Text, (*Jer.* 1.10. *I have ſet thee over the Nations, and over the Kingdoms of the Earth.*) Great as the violence he offers

to the Emperours Crown and Soveraign Dignity. But it admits a plea whether to his excuſe in part or to his greater ſhame, let the Impartial Judg without violence to both the Text and Princes, he had loſt his longing, for neither do freely grant the Popes that Supremacy they muſt have, or they miſcarry, though I think it was not the denial hereof was the cauſe of the miſcarriage of the Female Pope; though both mother and brat too (I do gueſs, for I find not a word of this Popes Nieces or Nephews) died in the Child-bearing: Yet be it or better or worſe for our own Clergy, or the ſhavelings of *Rome*; the Secular Authority did once govern the Clergy in the Church of the *Jews*; and ordinary Prieſts, the High-Prieſt and Prophets themſelves ſubmitted to it; whence our obedient and learned Clergy have example to their dutifulneſs, and the Papal Clergy a reproof of their diſloyalty; and our *Theſis* hath a good evidence of its truth; which I ſhall now endeavour to prove by ſome farther Reaſons (though I think enough to make out the truth hath been already delivered) perhaps Reaſon may convince ſome who are not willing to ſee the truth in Scripture-precedents.

Pope *Joan*, who was call'd *John* the 3*d*. a ſtory avow'd by more than fifty Authors of the Popiſh Religion, as Dr. *Prideaux*, and *Blondell* witneſs.

Reaſ. 1. The Clergy are ſubject to the Government Secular, or elſe one of theſe two things will follow, *viz.*

1. *Either each Clergy-man is a Soveraign*, and under no Law and Government, *which no ſober man ever yet dreamt of*, for this were to make every of them a God, or a King: Or elſe,

Staniſlaus Orichorius affirms that a common Prieſt is as much better than a King, as a Man is better than a Beaſt. *Chimæra* p. 97. a.

2. *That they are by a Subordination of Perſons of their own profeſſion, Subjects and Vaſſals to a Supream Eccleſiaſtical Independent*, or abſolute *Power without, or above, or againſt the Civil Power*; which as no Loyal heart would wiſh, ſo no Royal Crowned head ſhould endure; for ſuch conſiderations as I ſhall now offer to the Readers conſideration.

1. *This were to make either a native ſubject equal to his Soveraign Prince, or to render a conſiderable body of his People Subjects to a forreigner*; which appears thus: If the body of the Clergy (and the orders of the profeſſed Religious) be only ſubject and under the ſole Government of one of their own Profeſſion; and whoever is a native this perſon is, and his Succeſſors will be (when advanced to the Supremacy and Eccleſiaſtical Soveraignty) ſet up in a power Independent on his Prince, and uncontroulable by his Prince, and ſo of a ſubject be made a Soveraign over the Clergy, whoſe obedience will be withdrawn from the Prince to the Eccleſiaſtical head, and Supream; or, If this Perſon, who is ſuppoſed Eccleſiaſtical Soveraign, and who ought to govern the Religious and the Clergy, be a forreigner, then he that by birth and blood is a ſtranger to the Prince becomes by this means the Lord and Soveraign over the

the whole body of the Clergy and Religious, which in many Countrys is no small part of the people,

In *England* I believe it was well-nigh one third Priests Religious; King *James* observes it in his Apology. *unum Galliæ Regnum habet ultra* 300000. *hominum millia quæ sub obtentu clericatus, monachatus, functioniſque Eccleſiaſticæ jugum Regis excuſſerunt.* P. Molin. De Monach. Temp. Pontif. Roman. c. 18.

2. *This would leſſen all the Princes and Soveraigns of the world in three things eſſential to the very being and ſtability, as well as to the Glory and Grandeur of their Kingly Thrones and Majeſty*; It would leſſen *their Freedom and liberty in making Laws for their whole Kingdom*, and ere they can reſolve on that Ordinance which they do apprehend will be for univerſal good of their Kingdom, they muſt enquire of the Eccleſiaſtical Exempts whether ſuch a Law would not violate the Eccleſiaſtical liberty, and ask them leave to make it, or elſe they ſhall be taught as *Anſelm* and *Becket* would teach their Soveraigns, or as *Paul* the fifth taught the Duke of *Savoy*, and the State of *Genoua*, and would fain have taught the State of *Venice*, but they proved ſtubborn Scholars, and enforced that preſuming tutor to forgo the Lecture.

Next *it would leſſen their Authority in commanding obedience to Laws made*; the Exempt Clergy would undoubtedly firſt conſider, whether the Obedience required were not an infraction of their Immunities, and how far it intrenched on the liberty of the Church, and when this is brought to an iſſue who does not ſee that the General priviledge pretended untieth the *(Vinculum neceſſariæ & debitæ obſervantiæ)* bond of a neceſſary Obedience which is due of Right to the Magiſtrate, and leaves the Exempt to the free determination, whether of good nature and voluntary choice he will comply with his Prince, or whether Prudence will not rather determine to ſecure their pretended Priviledg, and deny that to their Prince, which (they pretend) he hath no right to command. Almoſt by this means Obedience which by God and Nature is made the Prince his due, and the Clergy-mans debts is by a fraudulent pretext reduced to an uncertain and arbitrary benevolence. Here hence will enſue, *The leſſening of the Power which ſhould execute Laws made, and which ſhould ſupport the Power in executing of them.* How feeble is a Precarious Power? It is next to none which is but ſo much as the good nature of one like to ſuffer or be reſtrained by it, will allow it to be. All this I have ſaid is evident from an undeniable inſtance of *Paul* 5*th.* who better informed, or bolder reſolved, told the *Venetians*, *He would not endure them to judg Eccleſiaſtical Perſons who are not Subjects unto Princes, and whom they cannot chaſtiſe though they be Rebellious.* By this Princes may ſee how little Power that Indulgent Father the Pope

Tenentur Clerici obligatione non coactivâ ſed directivâ. Bellarm. de Clerici c 28.

Almoſt the third part of their Subjects and of their Territories is Church-men, and Church-livings, K. *Jam.* Epiſt. to *Free Princes*, p. 21. Hiſtory of the Quarrels between P. *P.* 5*th* and *Venetians*,

Anno 1605. *Paul* 5*th.* envying the Soveraign Authority that was given to the *Venetians* by God, Nature, and the liberality of Emperours and Popes, as ſoon as he had aſſumed the Papacy he began to ſearch out for ways to ſubvert it. *Il Cardinal.* part. 2. lib. 1. pag. 127.

would leave in their hands, who in Criminal cases of highest nature will so boldly deny them all power to judg Ecclesiasticks. Certainly by the same justice he taketh away power of judging by Laws Civil, he will also (when time serveth, and with equal right) deny them a power to make Laws to regulate the Obedience of the Ecclesiasticks, or if there be some daring Prince will venture to make the Law, the Pope, or who-ever shall be suppos'd the absolute Soveraign over the Clergy, shall by the injured Clergy have timely notice to interpose a Prohibition that the Obedience be not exacted, nor a non-Obedience to such Laws punisht. And what will remain to such a Prince but a Title and Name, lessened to such a degree, That he must owe the Peace of his Kingdom, the Reverence of his Royal Dignity, the Safety of his Person, and the Succession of his Posterity to the arbitrary will of every Clergy-man, or at least of the Ecclesiastical Prince.

2. *Reas.* They that are by the Word of God bound to pray *for the Secular Prince as for a Soveraign under whose Power and Authority they do live and enjoy the quiet and prosperity of their life, are certainly under the Government of the Secular Prince, both as to their Persons or Bodies, and as to their Estates or Goods, which have no small share in the peace and quiet that they should desire to enjoy.* I think little doubt can be made of this Proposition, or any thing contained in it; for it speaketh not of Prayers which (*ex debito Charitatis*) out of Christian charity we ought to make for all men, and specially for men in great Power who through a just favour may much advantage the Church of God. But we speak of Prayers that are to be made for particular Rulers under whom we either were born, or by Gods over-ruling Providence are for present determined. Now the Scripture doth thus direct, 1 *Tim.* 2. 1, 2. *I exhort therefore* (saith St. *Paul*) *that first of all Supplications, &c. be made for all men, for Kings, &c.* * In which words you have a Canon of the Apostle directing and commanding *Timothy*, and in him obliging Bishops to pray for all, for Kings and all in †Authority over us, that under their Government our life may be peaceable and quiet to our selves, whilest our Persons are defended from violence of the cruel, and our Estates are defended from the injuries of oppressors. Which certainly is a benefit as we enjoy in the place of our abode, so by the Government of the place where we abide: And this seems to be comprised in that of (*Eusebius* * citing) *Dionysius*, *without ceasing we pray for your Kingdom that it may abide unshaken*, in the stability whereof our affairs will abide stable and safe. Now who sees not that this needs must be in that State or Kingdom where those live who are bound thus to Pray?

* παρακαλῶ, &c. *Sicut Imperatores Romani mandata dare præsidibus solebant, ita Paulus in Timotheo mandata dat Episcopis*, Hug. Grot. in loc.

† Jer. 27. 17, 18. commands the Priests to submit to the Government of the King of *Babylon*, and he enjoyns them to pray for the Government and Governors, *c.* 29. *v.* 1. and 7*th*. So that put these together they make up the Proof that Clergy are bound to pray for the Civil Government as that they ought to submit their necks to.

* Δι᾽ ἡσυχίας ὑπὲρ τῆς βασιλείας αὐτῶν ὅπως ἀσάλευτον διαμένῃ, προσευχόμεθα.

This

This Text then requireth those that pray to look on those Kings and Magistrates which in the Apostles words are βασιλεῖς ἢ ἐν ὑπεροχῇ, for whom they pray, as Kings over them, as their Rulers, and so consequently they must acknowledg themselves the Ruled or Subjects, according to the rule, That Relates do mutually suppose each other. In a word or two that the Clergy must pray for Kings, and for those that are in Authority, is certain enough from the comprehensive words of the Text: But for what Kings, *&c.* if for forreign, how much more for their own? If for their own then is it only that they may give good counsels, and by them direct the Clergy? This hath very little availed with resolute and turbulent Clergy-men, and can as little contribute to quieting the life of the disturbed as it can restrain, punish, and by coercive Power chastise the disturbers, which if it be (by an ill chance as often it hath been) found to proceed from the Clergy, alas the Prince is left helpless, and the Laity is left hopeless. And we had need to have another manner of address, *viz.* That all Men and Kings, and all in Authority should pray for the Clergy, that they may be good-natur'd, wise and thankful to God for their Immunities, that they may abuse none of their Immunities to the disturbance of the Prince or Laity, and so had we need the Text be changed. *Relata se mutuo ponunt.*

Reas. 3. The Clergy are bound to give an Exemplary Obedience and Fidelity to their King, that by their Example the People who are committed to them for Instruction may be induced to and setled in their Obedience and Allegiance; but such an Example is not given, but rather a contrary example of disobedience, disrespect, and contumacy, by a pretended exemption of the Clergy; they are not then exempt, but ought to be in body and state, or goods under the Civil Government. Thus briefly, they that by God are commanded to give Exemplary Obedience to Civil Government, are as to their Persons and Goods under the Civil Government; But the Clergy are so commanded: Therefore they are under it. The Major Proposition can admit no doubt; for such a command from God makes our Obedience due to such a Government; the only dispute can be whether God hath commanded the Clergy to give example of such Obedience now? Thus I prove it; God commands them Exemplary doing what is to be done for the Lords sake, and what is to be done for Conscience sake; the Clergy more than others are bound by their Profession to let the World know that they are Conscientious, and that they act for the Lords sake: But now Obedience to Civil Magistrates is so commanded for the Lords sake, 1 *Pet.* 2.13. and it is commanded for Conscience too, *Rom.* 13.5. That the Clergy are comprehended in those general commands, as I have already proved, so now I say to confirm it, That where the Scripture doth not, they cannot except themselves.

Obedience to the Civil Government is every-where but at *Rome*, and in her appendant Schools a Moral vertue, and a necessary Ingredient to make

make an honeſt and vertuous man. And therefore the Loyal Moraliſts, the wiſe Law-givers, with beſt warrant of Reaſon and Religion always required it in all Subjects, only *Rome*, (where it matters not how much blind obedience to the Pope, or how little Religion toward God they find in their Clergy), taketh care that their Clergy be not mancipated to the ſtrict Rules of Political vertues, leſt of good Citizens and obedient Subjects, they ſhould inſenſibly lapſe into a diſſerviceableneſs to the Papal Tyranny. But we muſt, guided by Reaſon and Scripture, acknowledg Allegiance a very great vertue, wherein (as in other vertues) the Reformed Clergy are bound to be Enſamples to their flocks.

Reaſ. 4. *They who do defend their Perſons and their Goods by the Authority and Power of the Civil Government, ought in all equity and reaſon to bear and profeſs true Allegiance to the Governours and Government.* The right which is done for them in ſuch caſes obligeth them to this duty, and the benefit from Governours to the Governed is a moſt juſt reaſon for Obedience from the Subject to the Prince. The Apoſtle St. *Peter* intimates this as one ground of Obedience, 1 *Pet.* 2. 13, 14. *Be ye ſubject, &c.* Why? *becauſe Governours are* εἰς ἐκδίκησιν κακοποιῶν, appointed to reſtrain the injurious, and oppreſſive by judging, condemning and puniſhing their injuſtice. They are alſo εἰς ἔπαινον ἀγαθοποιῶν, *for the praiſe of thoſe that do well*; Protecting, rewarding, and praiſing them. The benefit we enjoy ſhould in reaſon bind us to the obedience and ſubmiſſion we owe our Governours.

By this Argument St. *Paul* preſt the Chriſtians at *Rome* to Obedience, *Rom.* 13. 3. For *Rulers are not a terrour to good works, but to the evil, &c. Do good and thou ſhalt have praiſe of the ſame*, ſo verſ. 4*th*. *The Ruler is the Miniſter of God for good*, &c. therefore *be ye ſubject*. And this is the Prophets reaſon, *Pray for the Peace of the City*, &c. But it's *Babilon*; true, *but in the Peace thereof you ſhall enjoy peace*, Jer. 29. 1. with *ver.* 7. So then the Argument holds good in the Prophets and Apoſtles Logick; They who enjoy the benefits of a Government muſt be obedient to the Government. And I would fain know what will become of all the pleas which the *Romaniſts* make for the Preheminence of Clergy-men, if this foundation be not ſolid and good; the great benefits the Laity reap from the counſel and labours of the Clergy, they judg reaſon enough for the Laity's Subjection to them. In a word to ſpeak Reaſon with Impartiality in the caſe, Let thoſe that are benefited, be ſubmiſſive to and obſervant of thoſe by whom they are benefited, then the common people & all the Laity will duly obſerve in Spiritual caſes the counſel & authority of their Spiritual Guides, and the Clergy in Civil and Secular Caſes will be left where Chriſt and St. *Peter* did leave them under the Civil and Secular Prince to be governed by him. There is indeed a diſpute whether the Right of Governing be originally in the Benefactor, becauſe of the Benefit he beſtows, or on ſome other account; but there is no diſpute, nor will it admit any, whether the Bene-

Beneficia conferunt jus & poteſtatem Benefactori.

Beneficiary be bound to his Benefactor, and ought for that very cause to observe and obey him.

Beneficia sunt argumenta juris postulandi, hominesq; ad officium jure debitum commovendi.

Fifthly, *What Priviledges and exemptions for their Persons or Estates, from common or publick burthens and services the Clergy do enjoy, they do enjoy through the favour of their Prince or Governour, who pleaseth to remit to them, what there may be some reason to perswade, but no Law, or Right to command from the Prince:* Who as at first he saw Reason to grant that favour, so will (I believe) continue it until he see a sufficient cause to recal his own Grant; which future cause may (by conjecture from what already hath been acted in our view) sooneſt arise from an usurping Ingratitude (the hereditary infirmity of the Papal See) which never giveth to any, what it can by fraud or force keep to it self: as the Grave and Impartial Author of the Council of Trent well observeth, on the Pompatick and Ridiculous Act of *Paul* the Fourth; giving the Kingly Title over *Ireland* to Queen *Mary*, who had derived it from her Father, and her Brother, and had assumed it to her self at her first coming to the Crown. Such Legerdemain hath long past at *Rome*, coined with the impress of gratitude or bounty, and when it hath cheated Kings and Princes, into a degree that awakens their resentments and just indignation; they will resume the exorbitant Grants of Priviledges, and teach the Papal Clergy to use more manners, and acknowledg that none of their Immunities granted by Princes, were intended to make them Princes fellows, or Rebels against them without guilt, or fear of answering at their Secular Judicatures. And when this shall come to pass, the Christian World shall understand the mistake of the Canonists in their Law; which assert, *That the Clergy, and all their Goods, are by Divine right free from the Power of Secular Princes.* Against which I shall now oppose no other Authority than the Concession of *Bellarmine*, one, as any other, able to say as much for, and as resolved to yield no more than he must needs in the Cause of the Ecclesiastick liberty; who confesseth (*lib. de clericis. c.* 28.) *That not one word can be produced from the Word of God, by which this exemption of the Clergy can be proved.* And therefore hence I shall briefly argue. They who owe their exemption of Body and Goods from Personal services and tribute to the Power of their Secular Prince; though by such favour they are actually free, yet originally they were subject to him, and of Right they still are: and if the Prince see cause to require it of them, they are bound to serve him with their Bodies and Estates, which is certainly to be under their Government. What the favour of the Prince granted once to any of his Subjects is as encouragement to their obedience, not as security to their disobedience, granted and it must be for common good: but when once it

Illud hercle pontificibus in more positum, de alieno corio ludere, & quod justis dominis auferre nequeunt, id ipsis elargiri. Histor. Conc. Trident. l. 5.

Clerici rebellio in Regem non est crimen læsæ majestatis, quia non est subditus Regi. Em. Sa. *Aphorisf. confessariorum in voce clericus. Edit. Antwerp. Et Colon.*

Clerici non possunt a judice politico puniri vel ullo modo trahi ad secularis magistratus tribunal. Bell. *de cler. c.* 28.

Clerici & eorum bona omnia jure divino libera sunt a potestate secularium principum.

Bona clericorum sunt & merito debent esse ab omnibus Principum terrenorum tributis libera, & exemptio ista humano jure non divino introducta est, prop. 5. propositione.

proveth

proveth a Universal, Publick inconvenience or mischief it ought to be reversed. Now Ecclesiastick Persons do owe their Immunities from personal Services and Tributes to the favour of their Secular Prince: Therefore their Persons and Goods are under their Government. If this do not appear evident, I would have a Papist tell me; What had been the Case of the Clergy, if such Immunities had never been Granted? Had they not been under the Civil Magistrate? What if necessity awaken the Civil Magistrate, and he seeth in point of prudence and safety, that these Exemptions and Immunities may not be continued, and so by a Law revokes them, Doth not the Clergy thereby return to their pristine Subjection? Ecclesiastical Immunities for the Bodies and Goods of the Ecclesiasticks are introduced, *Jure humano*, by the Law of Man; if no such Law had been made, or on just cause hereafter shall be repeal'd, no such Exemption had ever been, or else had been null'd though once granted; if no such Exemption had been granted, then had these Ecclesiasticks been equally subject with the non-exempt, and as much bound to obey the Civil Government as the Lays.

Sixthly, *The Clergy as such are in the essential constitution of their Office, and as to the Immunities that are necessarily appendant to it, or flowing from it, wholly of a different nature*, viz. *Spiritual*; *and therefore cannot in Reason claim Immunities which are in their nature Secular and Civil:* Such are these we have been discoursing of. Now, every one may soon know, that the Priviledges of every rank of men, are suitable to the Nature of that Office or Relation wherein they stand; so Civil Offices have the Immunities which are Civil, and Spiritual Offices are invested with Spiritual Immunities; as it is not a Priviledg due to a Christian as Christian, to be exempt from the Coercive Power of the Civil Magistrate; so neither is the Priviledg of the Clergy by vertue of their Office so great as to advance them above the Power of the Prince: God who knew what Priviledges were fittest for each Order of men, would sure have told us that the Clergy should be free from the Government of the Civil Magistrate, if he had either made or intended an Exemption in all Civil Cases should be a Priviledg to Ecclesiastick Persons. But *Bellarmine* himself confesseth, that there is not one Word of God proving such Immunities due to the Clergy. It were a great disorder, and would bring in a confusion upon the Universe to allow such a mixture; for why is not the Irrational creature raised to the Priviledges of the Humane Nature? What answer would a Shaveling give me to the question? Or why is the Humane Nature determined to a Satisfaction, with Priviledges below the Angelical? Is it not because their Natures are different? Well, why is this a satisfactory account of different Priviledges in different Ranks of Natural Beings, and may not be alike satisfactory, in the different kinds of Moral and Political Beings and Orders? These are as different as the other. It were a monstrous birth should a bruit bring forth somewhat half bruit and half

Lib. de clericis cap. 28. Nullum potest proferri verbum Dei quo ista exemptio confirmetur.

half Man, and I do not yet see any less than monster in this; that the Indelible Characters of Priesthood should stamp a Licence of Immunities in Secular affairs: Such mishapen births *Rome* may perhaps little wonder at and foster, but we must do with them as our Laws, enquire out the offender, and condemn all that are proved guilty: So may the Fathers of this mishapen brat speed when-ever they are taken in their Treasons, on the confidence that their Indelible Character protects them from the stroke of the Secular Sword.

Rome hath perverted the order of Government and made the Temporal submit to the Spiritual; contrary to the custom of so many ages. *Il Nipotis. di Roma. p. 4.*

7. Reas. *They who were born Native Subjects, and by Priesthood or Orders, enter not on any Relation that doth necessarily and justifiably abolish that former Relation; these though so ordained, remain Subjects to their Natural Prince, and owe him obedience still.* This Proposition surely none in their wits will deny; for the Native Subject is both as to Person and Estate under the Government of his Native Prince, and continues so until somewhat do *(jure)* by right, not only *(ex consequenti)* by consequence, abolish that primeval bond, which with his swadling bands, Nature and God put upon him. Now then, one of these two must be asserted by the exempt Clergy:

1. Either that they were never born Subjects, and so were in different sense from the Apostle born free. If they like not this, say

2. Or else though born Subjects, their Holy Orders have nulled that natural Allegiance, and defeated the Prince of so many Subjects as have been made Clerks. If this be the Case,

unum Gallia regnum habet ultra trecenta hominum millia quæ Jub obtentu clericatus & monachatus functionis; Ecclesiasticæ jugum Regis excusserunt; aliumq; a Rege summum Principem agnoscunt non modo in Spiritualibus sed & in Temporalibus. P. du Moul. de Temp. Monar. P. R. cap. 18.

I would enquire whence is this corroding quality in the Indelible Character, to eat out what is engraven so deep in our Natures by the God of Order and Nature? Certainly Christ and his Apostles never so tempered it: But *Rome* who found the bonds of Allegiance were fetters on them, restraining them from their resolved Usurpations, and hindring their growing Ambition, resolve what-ever comes on't; These Bonds must be broken, and these Cords must be cast off (to allude to that, *Psal. 2.*) and it must be done by some curious engine too, for else the noise of it would give an Allarm: In one word, The Grace of God in Christ to his Church, hath been so far from abolishing any, that it hath mightily fortified on all the bonds of Natural and just necessary Relations, in all sorts of men, Civil, and Sacred, and commands Ecclesiastical Persons as well as Civil, to observe the just Laws of those Princes, to whom Nature had before made them Subjects. It is not Christ's Canon, but the Canon of Antichrist, which to make good Clerks spoils good Citizens. Had the truth in this been as consistent with Papal designs, as the distinct duties of a good Subject, and Sa-

cred Person are consistent in one Person, I had neither troubled you and my self, nor had they troubled the World with this Controversy; It were time for Princes to command no more Priests should be made, until *Rome*, or who else do pretend the same Prerogative, had learnt to preserve a Loyal and good Citizen, while they make an Ecclesiastical Officer: might my motion be heard, they only should confer Orders on Subjects who had learnt this skill.

Eighthly, *And lastly, were this a Truth*, That the Clergy were both as to Bodies and Estates not under the Government of the Civil Magistrate, *How could the Primitive Christians, the Martyred Bishops, the persecuted Clergy, avow it to the World, that Christianity did not teach any thing destructive or dangerous to Commonwealths and Civil Governments?* How great an impudence would it be in it self to deny? Or how greatly would it have been to the shame of the suffering Christians, if that their adversaries could charge on them, that they professed a Religion which directly spoil'd the Magistrate of his Coercive Power over their Priests, and *Indirectly, i. e. in ordine ad spiritualia*, in relation to spirituals, spoiled him of his Coercive Power over the rest of his Subjects. *Julian*'s *Sarcasme* had been but a Retaliation to them, if they had been so principled and perswaded. Might he not with some colour of Reason; plead, You have spoil'd me of Supreme Authority over Sacred Persons their Bodies and Estates, as too Holy to be commanded by the polluted hands of Secular Princes: And I judg the Persons of Priests and Christians too Holy to meddle with the polluting things of this World, and will, *in ordine ad spiritualia*, free them from those cares and businesses? Had there been a proof made before any one Tribunal of the *Roman* Emperours, that the Christian Religion had published, maintained, and practised such a Proposition; the impartial World would soon have pull'd off the mask, and shew'd undeniably that those pretended Martyrs were not condemned for the profession of their speculative opinions, or the owning of the Truth of the History of Christ: but that these pretended Martyrs were real and avowed Traytors, enemies to *Cæsar*, to the Civil Government, and dangerous usurpers on the Supreme Authority of the Prince. Such Martyrs indeed may now be talkt of in *Rome*; but what impartial Judg will not condemn the Treasonableness of the crime which deserved, and the Impudence of the Plea which defends the sufferers, who died for disloyal rejection of their Native Prince, and traiterous subjecting themselves to the Power of a Forreigner, enemy to him in whose Kingdom they do flourish or might flourish?

He derided the Christians he rob'd with this scoff, that he would make their journey to Heaven more expedite and easie.

Now after so much Reason pleaded for the subjection of the Clergy in Civil Causes to the Civil Magistrate, it may perhaps seem to some incredible, that any Doctrine by any Doctor should be avowed contrary hereunto; can there be such an unreasonable opinion entertain'd, or maintained by any? *The next thing proposed for to be treated, will plain enough*

enough shew both who are the Teachers, and what is that they Teach in this point: Wherein I will be brief, and but name particulars. *The Church of* Rome *hath* (excepting some few) *in all places where they durst act barefaced owned this, and strongly contested for it:* That neither the Goods nor the Persons of their Clergy, or Religious, were under any Coactive Power of the Civil Magistrate. Indeed some Persons of the Roman Communion as Loyal, as Learned, do disclaim such exemptions and Immunities, content with the favour of their Sovereign; to whom they are ready to acknowledg they owe their Immunities whatever they are, above the Immunities that their fellow-Subjects enjoy for their Persons or Goods: Nay, whole Churches and Seignories that we rightly account Popish, as the *French*, the *Venetians*, do accord with the Protestant Churches, in the just opposition of such unlimited and absolute Immunities for the Clergy, and maintain the Sovereign Authority of the Prince over the Persons and Estates of the Ecclesiasticks. Or in the Words of a Person of Honour who hath lately spoken to this case on the by. *God be thanked that senseless Usurpation and exemption of the Clergy from the common Justice of Nations, is pretty well out of countenance, and since the Republick of* Venice *so notoriously baffled* Paul *the fifth in that very point; other Kings and Princes have chastised their own Clergy for transcendent Crimes, without asking leave of his Holiness, or treating them in any other manner than they do their ordinary malefactors.* This is the Case now, but time was when the Pope and the Clergy would not so easily have forgone their Usurpations, and Princes how great soever, should have hardly exercised such an undoubted Right: And time will come again (if ever the Pope can attain to a Power that may encourage him to revive his pretended Right) when he will exempt the Clergy from the jurisdiction of Secular Princes, and resume all the Causes which concern the Persons or Estates of Clergymen into his own hand, and determine them as proper only for his Cognisance. Nor do I surmise more than I have ground for; it was some ages past, the humour of the Pope and his adherents, and still is their aim, as will be evident to those who can and will consult at leisure.

3. General Who they are that exempt the Clergy from the Government of Secular Princes.

The Church of *Rome* generally.

Animadversions upon Fanaticism Fanatically imputed, &c. by Dr. *St.* And the imputation refuted and retorted, by *S. C.* p. 143. and 144.

A common Priest is as much better than a King, as a Man is better than a Beast: Nay, as much as God Almighty doth excel a Priest, so much doth a Priest excel a King. *Staniflaus Orichovius in chimerâ. fol.* 97. cited by *H. Fowlis*, p. 37.

First, *The treatises of some modern Jesuits excellent Schollars, yet sworn supporters of the Popedome*, and very zealous sticklers for the Immunities of the Clergy; as resolute Souldiers who defend the outworks, for the greater safeguard of the City. *So Bellarmine in his Book de clericis*, avows, The Clergy by Divine Right, free from the Authority of the Secular Princes. And *Emanuel Sa. tells you* what he thought in the Case, when he gives you a *Jesuitical i. e. an impudent and treasonable Reason*, why a Clergy-Man cannot be guilty of Treason: *viz.* Because

Aphorism. confessariorum in voce clericus. Edit. Colonienſ. & Antwerp.

the Clergy-Man is not the Prince his Subject. So in the *Colen* and *Antwerp* editions of his Book.

Secondly, *The Constitutions of some Councils; nor is it to be wondered at*, that *since Popes got usurped Power in their hands*, they can by the Ecclesiastical Diet assume what Immunities may for future establish their Hierarchy, and confirm what hath been usurped with much profit and advantage to their Church and Cause.

Superioribus mensibus ad nostram & Apostolicæ sedis audientiam pervenit Ducem & Senatum Reipublicæ Venetorum---- diversa decreta ——— Ecclesiasticæ libertati ac immunitati contraria, tum Generalibus Conciliis & sacris canonibus, nec non Romanorum Pontificum constitutionibus repugnantia statuisse —— Eosdem Ducem & Senatum.

Et Senatum Scipionem Sarracenum Canonicum Vicentinum & Brandalimum Valdemarinum Forojulienſem Abbatem —— Personam in dignitate Ecclesiasticâ constitutum ob quædam crimina---- commissa cancelli mancipasse & mancipatos detinuisse sub prætextu quod eis hæc facere liceret.

Thirdly, *The Decretals of Popes* (which is as valid an Authority, as the Ordinance of a Prosperous Rebel, determining himself and his confederates Innocent Persons and Loyal Subjects) and their Bulls, among which that of *Paul* the Fifth against the Duke and Republick of *Venice*, as it is late so may suffice, being backt with Nine or Ten Precedents of other Popes, in like Cases. *Whereas of late it came to our ear, that the Duke and Council of* Venice *have enacted divers Decrees contrary to the Liberty and Immunity Ecclesiastick, and repugnant to the Sacred Canons and General Councils, and to the Constitutions of the Roman Popes.---- And the said Duke and Council have Imprisoned and detained in Prison,* Scipio Sarracenus, *and* Brandelino Valdemarino, *Persons in Ecclesiastick dignity, for certain Crimes by them committed: All which is done with pretence, that it was lawful for them (Duke and Senate) to do these things.*

Here you have the Act of the Illustrious Duke and State secretly traduced as an unjustifiable Act, and the Power (by which they do it), represented to the World as an Usurpation prejudicial to the Church-exemptions. The Crimes of the Persons were notoriously foul, especially of the Abbot, *viz.* Sorcery, Rapes, Incest, and many Murthers which the Papal softness terms, *certain pretended crimes (as was reported) by them committed*, for which, as well they deserved, they were Imprison'd: But *The Premisses being prejudicial to the Rights of the Apostolical See, and to our Authority* (saith *Pope Paul the Fifth*) *and to the Priviledges of the Persons Ecclesiastick, and for that they overthrow the Liberty and Immunity of the Church.*

Quædam prætensa crimina---- per illos ut dicebatur---- commissa.

Cumq; præmissa---- sedi Apostolicæ, nostræ Autoritati, & Ecclesiarum Juribus, & Ecclesiasticarum personarum privilegiis præjudicium inferant, ipsamq; libertatem & immunitatem Ecclesiasticam tollant.

His Holiness good man! could not bear it, and therefore after much ado he comes to tell us what he will do, and with what good examples and

and warrant for it in these words, and with the great names of Ten Popes. *We who by no means ought to endure that the Ecclesiastical Liberty and Immunity, or our Authority and the Authority of the Apostolick See should be violated and contemned, following the example of most General Councils, and of fresh memory the examples of &c. And other Popes our Predecessours, who have revoked the like Statutes publish't against the Ecclesiastick Liberty, as Statutes which in justice were Null, Invalid and not Ratified, and who have decreed and declared that they were Null, Invalid, and of no force.*

Nos qui nullo Pacto ferre debemus ut Ecclesiastica libertas & Immunitas, nostraq; & sedis Apostolicæ Autoritas violetur & contemnatur, Inhærentes plurimorum Generalium Conciliorum decretis, ac vestigiis *Re. Me. Innocent.* 3. *Honorii:* 3. *Gregorii:* 9. *Alexand.* 4. *Clem.* 4. *Martini.* 4. *Bonif.* 7. & 9. *Martini.* 5. *Nicolai.* 5. Et Aliorum *R. P.* prædecessorum Nostrorum qui similia Statuta alias contra libertatem Ecclesiasticam edita tanquam ipso jure nulla, invalida & irrita revocarunt, ac nulla invalida & irrita decreverunt & declararunt. ———

In a little Paragraph you see how much less the Pope makes of the Authority of free Princes, and how he doth pronounce that his Predecessours and General Councils have in like Cases asserted the Ecclesiastical Immunities; and a Sovereign Prince may not punish Rapes, and Murthers in a Person who is dignified with the Orders of the Church, if he doth, though they are Nullities in themselves, they shall be (as in this case they were) declared a-new from *Rome* Nullities. *On Mature deliberation with our venerable Brethren the Cardinals of the Holy Church of* Rome, *with their consent and Council, (though the foresaid Decrees, Edicts, and Commands, were in Law it self Null, Invalid, and Void) by these Presents we do decree and declare notwithstanding a-new, that they were and are Null, Invalid, and Void, of no force or moment; And that none are bound to the observing of them.*

Habitâ cum venerabilibus fratribus nostris *S. R. E.* Cardinalibus matura consultatione de ipsorum consilio & assensu (licet supradicta decreta & edicta, & Mandata ipso jure nulla, invalida, & irrita sint) ea nihilominus ipso jure adhuc de novo nulla, invalida & irrita, nulliusq; roboris & momenti fuisse & esse & neminem ad illorum observantiam teneri per præsentes decernimus & declaramus.

Excellently spoken! and like the Successor of an humble Fisherman! Though the Duke of *Venice* may marry the *Adriatick* without a license from *Rome*, He may not imprison a murtherous Abbot without the hazard of losing his Principality; Who would not wish to be a Denison of *Rome*, if a Conclave of the Purple Fathers may reverse a Law which was made to restrein the enormous violences of Clergymen? Compassionate Fathers that prefer the safety of their single Sons to the safety of whole Kingdoms!

By this you see Jesuites, Cardinals, the Consistory, the Popes successively, and General Councils (if there be truth in the Pope's Bull)

Synodus seculares Principes admonuit——— nec permissuros ut officiales——— Ecclesiæ & personarum Ecclesiasticarum Immunitatem violent &c. Concil. Trident. Sess. 25. cap. 20.

ex-

exempt the Clergy from the Coactive Power of a Civil Magistrate against Nature, Reason, and Religion. How far they would allow the Directive Power if time favoured them, I give you leave to guess from the late instance of Pope *Urban*, 1632. and Pope Innocent the Tenth; This latter interposing between the French King, requiring Cardinal *de Retz* to renounce his Title or pretence to the Archbishoprick of *Paris*, reviving the old Maxime, *That Princes ought not to be suffered to meddle in Ecclesiastical affairs, this being to put their Sickle too boldly in another man's harvest:* The former refusing to admit *Ferdinand* 2. his Embassadour extraordinary which was Cardinal *Pasman*, *for avoiding* (as the excellent Historian *Bapt. Nani* reports it) *to admit such an Embassadour, he alledged, that a Cardinal honoured with the Purple and a Holy Character could not be employ'd in the service of Secular Princes.*

History of Management of Cardinal *Mazarine. tom.* 1. *part.* 3. *p.* 267.

History of *Venice. lib.* 9. pag. 368.

This is plain dealing however, and so far Princes are obliged; that they will speak their minds sometimes freely. Now I see if Clergymen offend the Laws, Princes are ill-natur'd to punish, because Clergymen owe them obedience to Directive Laws; And if they employ them in a matter unwelcome to his Holiness, the Princes make too bold with them that bear the Impress of a Holy Character; so precarious must the Rule of Princes be over an exempted Clergy. Yet, What Reason may be supposed for this? Certainly so great a Priviledg cannot in Reason be pretended by wise and honest men, to be warranted by light and trivial Arguments.

4. General. The Reasons, for exemptions Ecclesiastick.

Two sorts of Arguments I usually meet with urged; First, Drawn *ab Indecoro*, from the unseemliness of subjecting the Clergy to the Government of the Civil Magistrate, and this hath three indecencies in it; of which by and by.

The Second drawn *a Jure*, from their Right to be exempted, and this also is threefold, of which ere long. Mean time return we to the first.

1. Ab indecoro.

It is, say the Papal Orators, a very unseemly thing that the Clergy should be so subjected. For my part if there be an Indecency in it, I could be glad the Indecency were removed, I should think some advantage would thereby accrew to the Reformed Clergy; but without Spectacles of the Papal make, we shall never be able to descry the Indecencies; let us borrow Cardinal *Bellarmin*'s and with them look how unhandsome it is.

That Shepherds be under their Sheep. Answer.

First, *That the Shepherd should be under the Government of the Sheep.* This is a clear Case: But the mischief is, *Similitudes are no Demonstrations*; Nor doth the *Scripture* forbear to *call Kings Shepherds*, and perhaps oftner than the Priest is called so; and *the Argument is retorted Clergy-men are in Seculars* and Civil matters to a Man (except some few crafty Foxes among them) *Sheep, The Prince is their Shepherd, It is undecent that the Sheep should be exempt from the Shepherds Government:* Therefore undecent the Clergy be exempt from the Civil Magistrate, so we dismiss the first.

Secondly,

2. It is an Indecency *that he who to day governeth as the Clergy-man from the Pulpit in confession, or giving ghostly counsel to the Prince, should to morrow be cited before his tribunal, and be judged there.* Very good!

Indecent that he who preacheth this day should to morrow be judged by them he preached to.

2. An *Indecency* I confess there is *that* a *Clergy-man* should by any misdemeanor *deserve it*: But as the Fathers in the Council of *Trent* sometime argued to their advantage: Customs manners and humours alter, and what was handsome of old becomes unhandsome now; and besides, Countrys differ; nothing more graceful than to be mounted on a white Ass among the *Jews*; but the Pope would resent it as an high affront if his Catholick Majesty should by a strange activity (like the Transubstantiating act of the Priest) turn the white *Neapolitan* Courser into an Ass for the Tribute due to his Holiness for the Kingdom of *Naples*, and send it for him to ride on. In a word all we heretical Protestants (and a great many of the good Catholicks of all Countrys) fancy to our selves, That it is very meet to see a Clergy-man preaching to his Prince from the Word of God, whilest he is dutiful and loyal; and to see him imprison'd and executed for his Treasons when he is guilty; if this be an unlucky custom among us, let the Clergy be (as the Protestant will be) loyal, or keep out of places where are practiced such unhandsome customs and laws, as to hang, murthering and fellonious Priests in the common fashion of other Rogues without leave askt of the Pope.

What is truly indecent in the case.

Indecencies as men fancy.

No Protestant can see this Indecency, & many Papists can't see it.

3. A third Indecency is, that the Clergy who are servants of God and sacred persons, should be judg'd by the Vassals of the World, and the impure hands of Laymen. A mighty absurdity if well considered!

Indecent the servants of God be subject to Vassals of the World.

I never knew the full weight of this Argument before I had met with the information that *Staniſlius Orichorius* gave me, *That every common Priest does as much excel a King as a beast does excel a man.* Now by this Rule it were as much pity to see a King judg, condemn, and cause to be hang'd, or headed a Priest, as it would be to see a Horse, or Ass by an usurped power turn upon and execute his Master and driver. In a word when I see the usurping beast so use a man I will endeavour to prevent the absurdity: But if ever it be my lot to see or hear a Soveraign Prince judg, condemn, and put to death a shaveling, and one of *Romes* Consecrated Priests, (or one of a more reformed profession) under the guilt of capital crimes, I should desire the Father to excuse me untill I saw as clearly as *Staniſlius* did, The Priest was the man, and the King the beast; and ere that will be, my help will stand him in as much stead as a pardon doth after the Criminal is hanged. Lastly I wonder Kings will endure such absurdities when they might prevent it; let *Rome* make their Priest less, and account Kings greater; or if this superlative Greatness be essential to the Priesthood, I humbly submit the resolution, whether it were not fitter such a Priesthood should be aboliſht than all Kings be thus made Asses, (and without impair of their Intellectuals, and without the exemplary miracle wrought.

Answer'd.

wrought on a proud Heathen, only by the pride and ingratitude of a Papal Clergy, be thus turn'd a-grazing with beasts.

The Reason why the pleas are slighted in the Answer of them.

This is the sum of *Bellarmines* three Arguments, from the Indecency of the thing, and this all the Answer I think them worthy of; since his Eminency hath set up such scar-crows, and would fright us with them, let us have liberty to deride them as men would the bug-bears that Children set up; if better Arguments for the cause could (of this, or any other kind) have been produced, the learned Cardinal would have urged them, and then a better answer might have been given. But a puff will better blow away a feather than a mighty engin, and all the cost and labour would be lost that were bestow'd to bring Cannon, Spade, Mattocks and Engineers to overthrow a poor hutt, or cottage. From these pass we to the second sort of Arguments.

2. Sort of Pleas *a Jure Divino.* Answer.

A *Jure Divino*, saith the Canonist, by Divine Right; but *the Canonist* who saith it *hath the wit to let us seek the Text*, for he takes not himself bound in duty to cite it, and we deserve not the kindness that he should do more than he thinks himself obliged unto: Others of the fraternity dissent and think they have reason to pretend the Immunities to be *Jure Humano*; and until they agree how the Clergy among them came by these Immunities we shall not think it breach of charity or good manners to tell them, we wish they came honestly by so rich a Commodity; certainly Christ never gave it them, nor do the more modest pretend his gift, they are content with the collation by Popes Decretals first, or next by favour of General Councils, ever since the Papal Power grew too great for Kings and Emperours; ever since the one durst not contemn, and the other was so hardy as to denounce Excommunications against infringers of the Immunities Ecclesiastical. These two will prove their Right to these Immunities in any place, and at any time where Power and Injustice are too great to be called to account: And as good Right they have to these Immunities as the Pope and Councils could give them, and I hope you will believe the Pope and his Councils would not fail to invest their sworn Vassals with power enough to disturb the Civil power, and lessen it, that the Monarchy of the Papal Church might more speedily and safely be aggrandized; they have these Priviledges indeed from the Ringleaders in the Conspiracy to strengthen it against the just Authority and Soveraignty of Princes. And now you clearly see how honestly they come by it, ask their fellows whether they be thieves?

A Jure Humano answered.

But a third Plea is from the Favour of Princes they enjoy these Immunities. True, the more is their ingratitude and shame, they abuse that favour to the lessening of their Prince; who hath too often had many occasions given him to repent his Grant, to restrain his favour, and to teach the unthankful Clergy more duty, by requiring more. What the Prince giveth they enjoy without our envy, or complaint; let them keep within those bounds, and I will not disturb them. Finally to conclude

clude this point, now the Clergy (in all places of the world where the Prince is Christian) enjoy many considerable Immunities *Jure Humano*, which Immunities they never had Right to claim, till the Prince had Will to give; And which they may not expect to enjoy, when either abuse of them provokes the Prince to revoke them, or emergent inconveniencies perswade him to diminish or null them. What is so granted, is neither Immutable in its Constitution, nor ever intended to the publick prejudice of the Prince and State; nor can it exalt the Clergy into a state of absoluteness and non-subjection to the Prince; or if you would imagin a soft Prince should so inadvertently, and in a transport of zeal to the Clergy and Church, grant them such a Priviledg (as the *Roman* Clergy right or wrong will pretend unto) yet good Statists and best Reason will tell them, that the Grant being made to the prejudice of the Crown, it is neither good nature nor manners, nor justice to require it of their Prince, whose honour and dignity they are bound to conserve; *Errante clave*, the Infallible Decrees are null, say some *Romanists*; *Errante Sceptro*, Civil Grants to Subjects become Nullities. And such are the uncontroulable Immunities of the unsubjected *Roman* Clergy, to whom Princes had been less kind had they foreseen what use would be made of their Royal favours, and to whom they are not less equal and just, though for their Crowns and Honour more resolved and prudent, in recalling the ungovernable Ecclesiasticks to that Subjection, which they ought in equal degrees and readiness with other Subjects give unto their Prince, whether by assistances from their Estates, or by their Persons; both being, as our Thesis averreth, under the Government of the Civil or Secular Prince.

After so prolix Discourse on the positive part of our Position; I come to a briefer handling of the Negative parts of it, which was the fifth and last thing I proposed in the method of our proceeding. And so,

1. Consect. *The highest Power and Authority Ecclesiastical, as such, is lower than the Soveraign and Supream in all Matters Civil and Secular in what man or body of men so ever it be pretendeded* de jure *to be, or* vi & fraude *it be found by Usurpation to be.* This follows from the former suppositions as they have been proved, and is evident enough in it self: If the Clergy as to Bodies and Estates be under the Civil Government, then it follows they are not as Clergy-men Soveraign, for he is no Soveraign in the same respect wherein he is under anothers Authority; these are inconsistent: for Soveraignty and Supremacy set the Person in whom they are, above all within the limits of his Jurisdiction; but Ecclesiastical dignity, or the holy Character, leaves the Person on whom it is impress, under the Subjection he was in before. 5. General.

It is possible (though the case hath seldom happened) that a Soveraign Prince may be a Clergy-man, or he that hath a right to a Soveraignty may succeed in his Right after he hath entred Holy Orders; yet the Powers are distinct, and the Civil usually most esteem'd and retained while the other is laid by; as in *Rome* it sometimes happens among the Princes of the Red Hat, when of a Cardinal they are well pleas'd to become Duke or Prince in Hereditary Principalities, descending on them by the death of the former Heirs. A Soveraignty I know is annexed to some Ecclesiastical Titles and Persons, as in *Germany* to some Bishops, and to the Arch-Bishops, Electors. But they that know their Constitutions can readily tell us, how much they owe to *Jus Humanum* for it, and how little they owe to their Holy Orders, and the Priviledg of Clergy stated, *Jure Divino*, or indeed *Jure Ecclesiastico*. And notwithstanding any such intervenient occurrence it still holds a truth, No Clergy-man as such, and in vertue of his Holy Orders is, or can be *Jure*, and of Right a Soveraign and Supream, but is still under the Secular Prince, and his Government in matters Civil.

Girolamo Grimaldi Cardinal, was born with the quality of Soveraign, as Prince of *Monaco*. *Il Cardin. p.2. l.2. p.* 151.

Giovanni Casimiro resign'd his Cap, 1648. for the Crown of *Poland*.

Mauritio Son to the D. of *Savoy*, renounc'd for a Lady, *i. e.* Wife.

Cæsar Borgia second Cardinal, murther'd his Brother, turn'd Soldier, was made General of the Church Armies, receiv'd in dowry the Dutchy of *Valenza*; and that by Marriage he might perpetuate the Dukedom in his Family, I guess that this Duke *de Valentinois* quitted his Cardinals Cap in time of *Alexander* the *6th*, who entred the Popedom 1492, and continued to 1502. Such like Metamorphosis you meet with in the Match of the Cardinal *Camillo*, Nephew to *Innocent* the *10th*. An. 1655, or 1654. So Church-dignities were exchanged for Secular advantages with a Wife. Such like occasion inspir'd a Passion into *Pamphilio* towards *Donna Aldobrandina* Princess of *Rossano* and Heiress of the Family, who out-weigh'd all the Cardinals Ecclesiastick concerns, though she married not this her lover: As the Managements of Cardinal *Mazarine*, *Tom. 1. part. 3. p. 75, &c.*

2. Consect. *Were the Pope* (what his flatterers say he is, and his Infallibility confirms) *the Supream Ecclesiastical Person and Head* to that stupendous body of Ecclesiasticks (and were this proved his Right by a better title than ever it was, or ever it will be), *yet still this cannot raise him to the dignity of Soveraign over Secular Princes or Kings.*

For be the Power whatever it is for its eminency, still it is an Ecclesiastical Power, and the Person in whom it is invested derives it to himself not immediately and *virtute Personæ*; but *mediate & virtute officii*; or indeed *Jure Ecclesiæ concessô* by a Right granted to the Church, and by the Church to be convey'd on a fit Person; and so the Person chosen by the Church receives not what Power his boundless ambition can grasp, but what Power the Church can bestow, which hath been proved to be still a Power inferiour to the Secular Power in all Secular affairs. It is a sure Rule in all Cases, *Nihil dat quod in se non habet.* Therefore well did *Sancho* brother of *Alphonsus* the *7th.* proclaims to the world the ridiculous Nothing the Pope gave him, proclaiming him, if he would conquer it, King of *Egypt*; and what his resentments were of such an idle conceit, when in requital of his Holiness bounty he commanded him to be proclaimed Caliph of *Bandas*, on the same condition of conquering

Thus *Adrian 4th* was rebukt for his presumption between 1193 and 1197. *H. Fowlis* Preface to History of Popish Treasons, &c. p. 36.

quering it. In brief, the Pope, pretended Head of the State Eccleſiaſtick *de facto*, is now a free Prince as he is Pope, and hath a Secular Power annexed to his Eccleſiaſtical Office. But if *Conſtantine*'s Grant, and ſome other Princes bounty be a forgery, it is eaſie to ſay how their Holineſſes came by, and how honeſtly they continue the poſſeſſion of ſuch Power: And if preſcription of time and poſſeſſion will not bar a Soveraign Prince his claim, there may ariſe ſome brisk Prince in the Empire who may ſtart a better title to thoſe Dominions, and reduce the Pope to the Primitive *decorum* of Biſhop of the firſt See; requiring him to be content with what Immunities the Imperial Council ſhall judg fit to allow him, ſince in all likelihood they will be more than were ever given by Chriſt to St. *Peter*, and his real or pretended Succeſſors. Let him whileſt he can, retain his Temporal Soveraignty, and within his own Dominions be above all Perſons in all Cauſes; yet this doth not flow out of his Eccleſiaſtick Office immediately, directly, and *per ſe*, as he is Biſhop, which is an order wholly of different nature to Secular Power and Matters. And therefore were he Univerſal Biſhop, yet his power would be but the power of a Biſhop, that is in Spirituals; and the engin of their own making cannot draw in Temporals *in ordine ad Spiritualia*. That was, as the Huntſmans dog in his younger days, nimble and hold-faſt, but the Cur is now old, and his teeth worn out, and every free Prince now will ſhake him off. They are weary of the cheat, and I hope will not let an Uſurper *indirecte & conſequenter*, take out of their hands that which God, Nature, Grace and Reaſon, have *directe & neceſſario* entruſted in their hands.

3. *Conſect.* The Clergy being proved in Body and Eſtate as to Civil affairs under the Government of the Secular Prince; *No Clergy-man of what degree ſoever he be, nor any body of Clergy-men combined together, can abſolve the Subjects of any Prince or free State from their Oaths of Allegiance. And if it be pretended, he or they may do ſo, the pretence is wicked; and if the pretended Power be executed, the Subject notwithſtanding is as much bound as ever, nay ſomewhat more bound on this occaſion, becauſe the Prince is in an apparent danger*; out of which to reſcue him, every good Subject ought to contribute his aſſiſtance for his Princes ſafety. The Excommunication, or the menace of an approaching Excommunication from ſuch a proud pretender, may be juſt reaſon why Princes ſhould require renew'd aſſurance of their Subjects Allegiance, and why Subjects ſhould give new inſtances of their conſtant duty; but it can be no reaſon why Subjects ſhould think themſelves free from their Obedience and Oaths. The condition of Princes through the multitude and weight of their affairs is of all mens the moſt uneaſie, when it is (the moſt it can be) eaſed by a ready and univerſal Obedience in the Subject; but how miſerable would it be on ſuppoſition that their Kingdoms were at the

diſpoſal of a forreigner! How unfaithful are our Hiſtorians, or how ſhameleſs hath the encroaching pride of the Pope and the Papal Clergy been! either they who write the ſtories of Ages paſt have moſt injuriouſly dealt with their own and other ſucceeding Ages, or the Papal power hath with might and main ſet it ſelf to ruin the Regal and Imperial Power. Now what will become of the Maxim which pleaded ſtifly for the Eccleſiaſtical power? 'Tis retorted thus: All Authority appointed of God, is by him entruſted with Power and Authority ſufficient to conſerve it ſelf, and effect its proper ends: But if a Biſhop, who is a Subject, may depoſe the Prince, and releaſe the ſworn Allegiance, the Power of the Prince is not ſufficient to preſerve it ſelf among Subjects; If the Biſhop be a forreigner, as the Pope is to all Princes, who doth excommunicate, and depoſe, and releaſe Subjects, then the Princes Power is not ſufficiently qualified to preſerve it ſelf againſt ſtrangers and uſurping enemies.

In brief; Thoſe that are Papal Biſhops, and were born Subjects, are equally with other Subjects, natural Leige-men to their Prince; for we have proved that the dignity of Biſhops doth not exalt them above the condition of Subjects: Now it is certain Subjects cannot abſolve their fellow Subjects; none can looſe the bond which doth as much tye himſelf as another; nor can Rebellion acquit Rebellion in a Subject. Thoſe Biſhops who being forreigners to a Prince, are always to be watcht as ſuſpicious, and moſtly to be oppos'd as enemies, though Biſhops (as Popes are accounted) can never be thought perſons to be intruſted with a Power over Kings and Princes, whom they treat with no other kindneſs than a man doth one whom he reſolveth to overthrow or humble with the firſt opportunity: So that as it is not in the Dignity and Office it ſelf, to convey an uncontroulable Power to a native Subject in any caſe over his Soveraign, ſo neither is it in the Office to convey ſuch a power to a forreigner; and both are a weakening of the Civil power to a degree of impotence that cannot defend its Subjects, or preſerve it ſelf, or attain the neceſſary ends of Government.

4. *Conſect.* If the Dignity of the Clergy be not ſufficient to advance the Clergy-man high enough above the Civil Magiſtrate (as hath been proved) in Civil Matters; *Then were the Pope Univerſal Biſhop, and had he rightful Power to Excommunicate* (which yet is not proved by any of his paraſites, nor yielded by any Proteſtant); *yet could he not deprive the Prince or King, ſo excommunicated, of his Dominions in part or whole.*

For in this caſe the Pope muſt act as a Biſhop; and this Office, as it is a Spiritual Office, and the Rules of it are Spiritual, ſo the effects and ends of it are alſo Spiritual, and ought to keep within theſe limits and bounds; but now, when (after admonition and intreaties prove vain) the Univerſal Biſhop ſhould Excommunicate, he hath gone to the utmoſt

that

that his Rule directs, or his Authority can enable him to; the Depoſing of a King, the giving his Kingdom to any that have the hardineſs to attempt, and the ſucceſs to gain it; as it is wholly of a Secular nature, ſo it is wholly forreign to the Office of any Biſhop. And it hath brought the greateſt confuſion, wars, bloodſhed, and deſolation into the Chriſtian World; that by this we might gueſs from whom this uſurped Power comes, ſince we know there have been ſuch direful effects of it, and theſe effects the natural and proper effects of ſuch unjuſt pretences. The Cenſure of the Church is an execution of a Spiritual Power, and was never appointed to leap ſo prodigiouſly high as with its foot to kick down the Crowns of Kings and free Princes; this (*tranſitus de genere ad genus*) skipping from a juſt execution of Eccleſiaſtical Power, into the Uſurpation of a boundleſs Power in Affairs Secular over Princes and Kings, is the moſt inſolent and intolerable preſumption; and which gives Gods Vicegerents in Civils, a juſtifiable plea to hate and oppoſe the pride and deſigns of the Papal Clergy, who by this means have with a kind hand given their inferiour Clergy ſo happy a lift, that the meaneſt perſon in Holy Orders among them, is *Jure & virtute Officii*, a better man than his Prince, whom he exceeds as much as a man exceeds a beaſt, or God exceeds the Prieſt, if you'l believe their flatterers. Amongſt whom the Learned Cardinal *Bellarmine* (miſimployed in the Office of Maſter of the Ceremonies) does ſet Kings below Biſhops, Prieſts, and Deacons too: ſo glorious is this *Roman* Church, that Kings like our droſſie bodies, ſons of the earth, fall ſhort of the Church-men as much as the body falls ſhort of the Soul. Bravely ſpoken! what pity is it that every Eccleſiaſtical Sacred Head hath not an eſtate and revenues to maintain his Grandeur as much in Magnificence above Kings as their Office hath ſet them: if ſuch tranſcendent Honour be the effect of Papal Ordination, our King and Parliament have reaſon to continue the Prohibition againſt the Subjects of this Kingdom going beyond the Seas to take Orders. It is not ſafe to have Subjects ſo advanced, and I do not wonder that Rebellion in a Clergy-man of the *Roman* Mint is become ſo ſmall a *Peccadillo*, or rather thin'd into an inviſible miſt, and though the Prieſt be viſible in the Rebellion and Treaſon, neither the Traytor, nor Rebel can be ſeen or found: alas good men and precious! the world unkindly owneth not their Excellency, and they by natural propenſities (flowing from their conſtitutive principles) do innocently aſpire to a ſtate equal to their Orders, which blind Hereticks nick-name Rebellion, and jealous Princes brand as Treaſon; and ſo the innocent Clergy (when they have the luck to be taken in it) are condemned and executed for Traytors. But the comfort is the enlightned Conſiſtory at *Rome* can ſee and diſtinguiſh the Clergy-man *quoad ſubſtantiam*, innocent, nay meritorious; it is the Prince or State which miſtook him, and under the ſeparate accidents and form of a Traytor bloodily

Staniſlaius Orichovius.

De Pontifice lib. 1. cap. 7.

Bellarm. de laicis, cap. 8.

bloodily cut off the mans head. Dull Souls that will not be informed in the myſtery of Tranſubſtantiating Rebels as well as bread. Well, how-e're it is that their Clergy muſt being judged by a ſevere Secular Judg die *(ſub forma perduellium)* in the unhandſome dreſs of Traytors; yet by the moſt indulgent hands of his *Roman* Holineſs, the World ſhall be informed of the error, and in compenſation for the hard uſage they met with be made as ſubſtantial and real Saints as ever the Pope made any: ſo may *Garnet* be executed at *Tyburn*, but be St. *Henry* at *Rome*; and thoſe that were *Beautifeu's* and ſet the World on fire, and threatned more prodigious Calamities to the World, are made Stars of great light and glory in the *Roman* heaven. Such unintelligible Doctrines, and ſuch intolerable practices have attended the licentious friſk of the Biſhop of *Rome* when πρόβατα ἔχητα, he excommunicates and makes Kings and Princes his prey, and ὁπιδεύῃ λεων, ſeizeth and devoureth the prey; and is thus become μεσοπτε χιμαῖες, *Chimera* real: Which may not be too ſeverely imputed to levity in me, ſince really I could not tell what to make of him; for in his Fore-parts I find the mouth of a Man, and hear the words of a Father in admonitions, but when I have looked down to the feet I ſee the Paws of a Lion, and his Talons always bloody with the prey under his feet torn to pieces, or deeply wounded; So I clearly ſee him in the Proſpect hiſtory gives of him, their own Gloſſary repreſents him not much more to his advantage:

Many have compar'd it (*Rome*) to the Monky that hugs its young ones to death, for juſt ſo do the Church-men who embrace every one with a Paternal affection, but in thoſe embraces they that receive them find their ruin. *Il Nipotiſmo, par.* 1. *l.* 1. *p.*32.

Clement. Proæm. *Papa ſtupor Mundi*---------
Gloſſ. v. *Papa.* *Nec Deus es, nec homo, quaſi neuter es inter utrumque.*

So of a well-conſtituted Officer as Chriſt and *Peter* left him (if you'l believe them) he is made a miſhapen Monſter, and the wonder of the World; and now in the unjuſt claim of the Father of Lies draws deceived proſelytes to worſhip him, ſhewing them the Kingdoms of the World, and the Glory of them, with promiſe that as they merit by their good ſervice to the Apoſtolick-Chair, he will give them a right, and when they can they may take poſſeſſion of his gift, for unto him pertain all theſe things, and to whomſoever he will he giveth them; and I aſſure you it is neither *Jure Divino*, nor *Jure Humano*, but *quaſi Neutro*, i.e. *Jure Inferno.*

5. *Conſect.* Hence it follows, *That Emperours, Kings, Princes and free States, are not Rightful Subjects to the Pope, or to any other ſingle Eccleſiaſtical Perſon, nor to any body of the Clergy-men, neither in Synods with Presbyterians, or in Convocations with Epiſcopal, nor in pretended General Councils with Papiſts, nor in the Conſiſtory or Conclave with the Cardinals and Pope collected together.* He that deſigned the Office in his Church

Church hath left these Officers under the Obedience of the Civil Magistrate in all Civil Matters which concern the Government of their Estates and Persons. In which cause so many have appeared, and so clearly vindicated the Royal Prerogatives and Soveraign Authority of Kings; not only Protestant Writers, but among the Papists themselves many very learned Pens have asserted the Supream and Soveraign Power of free States, that it is become in most Countrys a ridiculous Claim the Pope maketh, or any of his Vassals flatter him with, That their Prince is a Vassal and Subject to his Holiness; and that is now become as long since it should have been, a Trayterous Tenet and worthy of death, which was in the heighth of Popish Tyranny a necessary principle of the Papal Religion. How ill-natur'd soever the Children of that Church have proved, abridging their Father of his Power; I will not now enquire; but might a stranger to the Father and his Children speak a few words indifferently to both, I would adventure to say, it had been justice and honesty in the Ghostly Father to have left his Children the Power and Authority which he gave them, who said the Magistrates were gods, and then the Primitive kindness of Kings like *Constantine* the Great would have ensured the favours and observances of Princes to the Clergy: But since the Papal Infallibility hath almost reduced this affair to this hard choice, Either that we must have no Pope and Exempt Clergy, or no free and Soveraign Monarchs, I am easily inclined to believe, the Secular Princes will rather chuse that the Ecclesiasticks should part with their Immunities than that Princes should part with their Soveraignty; and how great a part of the Christian World would joyn with them is not hard to guess. The Soveraignty of the Pope is an Article of the Popes political Faith, but I verily think he hath more wit and care of his Soul than to make it an article of his Christian Faith: And if he will venture his soul, and the souls of his sheep on gage that he may keep his present Grandeur, I am well satisfied that he is not my shepherd, and I am not a little glad that there are so many Papists that do not make this an Article of their Faith. Free States and Kingdoms do know that Supream Soveraignty is not essential to Christs Vicar, *Peters* Successor, or Universal Bishop, that Exemptions of the Clergy are favours of the Prince and not natural and necessary properties of the Office; and which is ill news for *Rome*, have well considered the distinction between being of Communion with the Church Catholick, and with the Pope as first Bishop, and being in subjection to the Pope as to a Soveraign. They now are skilled in the Method of observing the Church, and opposing the Court of *Rome*. And though I know not what may *(per Possibile)* come to pass among men, and what King may make himself against all Right a Subject to the Pope, yet I am sure no King or Emperour can ever be rightfully the subject of the Pope who at most is but Bishop of the first See.

SER MON

SERMON IV.

The POPE of ROME is ANTICHRIST.

Mr Henry Wilkinson

2 Thes. 2. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10. *Let no man deceive you by any means, for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition.*

4. *Who oppoſeth and exalteth himſelf above all that is called God, or that is worſhipped: ſo that he, as God, ſitteth in the temple of God, ſhewing himſelf that he is God.*

5. *Remember ye not, that when I was yet with you, I told you theſe things.*

6. *And now ye know what withholdeth, that he might be revealed in his time.*

7. *For the myſtery of iniquity doth already work; only he who now letteth, will let, until he be taken out of the way.*

8. *And then ſhall that wicked be revealed, whom the Lord ſhall conſume with the ſpirit of his mouth, and ſhall deſtroy with the brightneſs of his coming:*

9. *Even him whoſe coming is after the working of Satan, with all power, and ſigns and lying wonders,*

10. *And with all deceivableneſs of unrighteouſneſs in them that periſh: becauſe they received not the love of the truth, that they might be ſaved.*

WE will firſt give you an Account of the Apoſtles writing here ſo fully concerning Antichriſt, and ſo proceed to handling the Words. The reaſon of his falling on this ſubject here, was upon the preaching of ſome among them, who told them, that the coming of the Lord to judgment would be very ſud-

denly

denly, in that age and time in which they lived, upon which report they were in a very great fear and dread. *v.* 2. They were shaken in mind, and this terrour and consternation of Spirit there is expressed under a double Metaphor. 1. From a Sea-storm that tears the Vessel from the Anchor and Harbour; so much the word σαλευθῆναι here used doth import, which comes from σάλος which signifies a Tempest at Sea. 2. By θρὸς taken from Souldiers, who by a panick fear arising among them, puts them into a disorder and confusion, so that they have neither head, nor heart, nor hand to act in a due manner: So it was with the *Thessalonians*, by reason of false Teachers, who by their blasts and storms of false Doctrines, *Eph.* 4. 14. shake men from their stedfastness: they were at present under great distraction and fear, from the false Teachers who did delude them; 1. By a pretence to an extraordinary Spirit, or Visions, and Revelations. 2. By Word and Preaching. 3. By Letter as from *Paul*, by which works they did exceedingly deceive them; and perswaded them to believe that the end of the World was at hand.

Whence we observe, 1. *That false Teachers do use all possible means and diligence, to prevail with persons to believe their false Doctrines.*

2. *False Teachers do so far prevail with many, that they rent and tear them as with a tempestuous wind, and put them into a consternation of Spirit as by a panick fear, so as that they can neither keep to the Truth, nor act according to it.*

In the Words you have, 1. The Revelation of the greatest Enemy that ever was against Christ and his Church, in the third *vers.* and the eighth. 2. You have a full and large Description of that Enemy, by several circumstances of time, place, *&c.* As also by several Characters and Names, by which this Enemy may be known from all other Enemies of Christ that ever were, or should be in the World. I shall wholly wave their opinion, who contrary to the whole stream of Interpreters, do take the meaning of this place to be concerning Christs Coming to destroy *Jerusalem*, and them that crucified Christ; and the Apostacy to be the Christians breaking off compliance with the impenitent *Jews*, and departing from them to the *Gentiles*: and the Man of Sin here described they take to be *Simon Magus*, together with the *Gnosticks*. But that this cannot be so meant, is plain, from the Season of entring of the Man of Sin, *&c.* who was to be revealed, and upon his Revelation, there would follow an Apostacy from the Faith before Christs Coming to judgment. That which did so terrifie the *Thessalonians* was this, that Christ's second Coming was at hand; then the Apostle tells them, that there was to be a great Apostacy upon the Revelation of the Man of Sin, which was to be many years, some Hundreds of years after this. As for *Simon Magus* and the *Gnosticks*, they were revealed before the writing of this Epistle; *Hugo Grot.* Dr. *Hammond*, &c. This Enemy is set forth as if he were a single person, but it is not so to be taken

in this place; for it is frequent in Scripture to set forth a Body Politick, or a Kingdom, or State, by a particular Person or *Individuum*. In *Dan.* 7. 1, 2, 3, *&c.* there be four Kingdoms, or Monarchies, which were in a Succession one after another in the World, deciphered by four great Beasts, which are interpreted to be four Kingdoms, *vers.* 17. or four Kings; and the fourth Beast is called the fourth Kingdom, *ver.* 23. And the vulgar Translation renders *vers.* 17. four Kingdoms: So that each Beast signifieth a multitude of men in a Succession, under one Government for several Ages; and so consequently the Head and Horns signifie the Power, and Sovereignty, of such a Kingdom for a long time in a Succession.

So we find, *Rev.* 12. 1, the state of the Primitive Apostolical Church set forth by a Woman in travel; and *vers.* 6. 14, by a Woman in the Wilderness. So *Rev.* 13. 11. the two-horned Beast, which is the same with the false Prophet, *Rev.* 10. 13, and 19, 20, and 20. 10, doth not signifie a single Person, or a succession of single Persons (suppose the Popes) but a Body of Deceivers under one Head or Government. It is generally agreed on by Protestant Writers, That the Pope as Head of that Antichristian state which is here described, is pointed at in this place; or that the Papacy, Head and Members, in a Succession making up one Body Politick, is that Monster which they call Antichrist. It is on all hands agreed on, That where-ever we find all these Characters, together with the Circumstances set down in the Text, to concenter, that must be The Antichrist, who was to be brought forth into the World before the second coming of Christ. He tells us of One to come, a strange One, a monstrous One, such a One as never was before; and that you may not be mistaken in this Prodigious One, he gives us the lively portraicture of him.

The first Character by which Antichrist is set forth, is the grand Apostacy which should attend his rise and reign.

Let us now descend to the particulars as they lye in the Text. 1. Antichrist is described by the Apostacy which should arise in the Church upon the coming of this Monster: He is an Apostate, and the cause of an Apostacy: there was to be ἡ Ἀποστασία, a very great Apostacy before his full Revelation, *vers.* 3. Apostacy is taken 1. Politically, so some take it for a falling from the *Roman* Empire. 2. Ecclesiastically, to fall from the Church or True Religion. 3. Figuratively, the Subject for the Adjunct, meaning the chief in Place and Power, that causeth others to fall away; as, 1 *Tim.* 4. 1. There shall be an Apostacy, there shall be such as shall fall away, and cause others so to do.

In the two latter senses it is taken here; for the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, set out by the Lamb with two Horns, *Rev.* 13. 11. is the grand Apostate and a cause of the great Apostacy of many, by causing by force and fraud to worship the Beast and his Image, *vers.* 12, 13, *&c.* The time of this Apostacy is a special mark of Antichrst's rising, 1 *Tim.* 4. 1, 2, 3. This Apostacy was to be in the latter times of the fourth

fourth Monarchy, set out by Fourty two Months, and One thousand two hundred and Sixty days, *Rev.* 11. 2, 3. and chap. 13. 5. The Apostacy of the Church from the Rule of Faith and Worship, by spiritual Fornication is a signal note of Antichrist, or the Antichristian State, of which the Pope is the Head; and his proper See is *Babylon* the *Metropolis:* And the Body which was to be ordered by this false Prophet as its supreme Head, was, and is, the Beast of *Rome*, with Seven Heads and Ten Horns, and Ten Crowns on his Horns. *Rev.* 13. 1. This Apostacy as to the time, is upon the rising of the Antichristian Papal State, when those Doctrines of Demons, and forbidding Marriage and Meats, which are peculiar to the Church of *Rome*, came into the Church; the old Pagan *Roman* Empire was broken to pieces, and had its deadly wound, which afterwards was healed by the two-Horned Beast, *Rev.* 13. 12. Framed into a likely Image of the former Pagan Beast, by reason of which, the visible Worship of Christ in the Church gradually was cast out, and the spiritual Fornication of Saints and Angels, Relicks, Images, and such like, which is renewed Gentilism and refined Paganism, came up gradually into the Church of *Rome.*

The Revelation of the Man of Sin doth appear by his rising gradually, and the time of his rising will appear by the Apostacy from the Rule of Faith, Worship, and Manners; so that if we can find the Defection of the Church, we know one chief Character of Antichrist. Some begin the Apostacy from the Primitive purity about 396. Many Popish errours come into the Church. *Wolph.* in *Centenar. Ferom.* 390. complains of the Avarice and Corruption of the Clergy, and of the prohibition of Marriage and Meats. And *Augustin* 399. complains how the Church was fallen from her Purity. *Wolphius* in his Epistle, and in his Book, *An.* 390. and 400. brings in a large Catalogue of errours crept into the Church, by which the times of the grand Apostacy may be known: And it pleased God to speak in a wonderful way from Heaven in those times, by prodigious Comets, *An.* 383, and 389. *Alsted. Chron. Comet.* Thus was the Man of Sin gradually revealed, and the Apostacy did gradually proceed. Indeed the Pope could not yet shew himself in the full exercise of his Power in the *Roman* Empire, for the Civil Power of the *Roman* Empire would not bear such a competition as the Hierarchy of *Rome*; and therefore the *Roman* Empire which is a Civil State, was to be taken out of the way, *vers.* 6, 7, 8. It was to be removed from the Seventh Head, the Old *Roman* Beast, as it was a Civil Government, and placed somewhere else, *i.e.* on the Pope or Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, which usurps the Power of both Swords. This could not be done before the deadly wound was given to the *Cæsarian* family, which the idolatrous blasphemous Beast was to succeed: This is the Beast which carrieth the Whore, *Rev.* 17. 3. which could not be done till the Imperial Sovereign Power of *Rome* was broken, and translated to the Pope; then the Man of Sin was more fully reveal-

ed. Upon this ground, *Jerom* when he heard of the taking of *Rome* by *Alericus* King of the *Goths*, expected the coming of Antichrist, *Epist. ad Ageruchiam*, *Qui tenebit* (saith he) *de medio fit & non intelligemus Antichristum appropinquare?* He that letteth is removed, and shall we not know that Antichrist is nigh? So in *præfat. l.* 8. in *Ezech. pascitur anima & obliviscitur, &c.*

Some state the beginning of the Apostacy, and the Revelation of the Man of Sin higher, some lower, but they agree in the main, That this Apostacy was by the Pope, and upon the fall of the *Roman* Empire: Some will have his Revelation to be about the time of King *Pepin*, and *Charlemain*. It is true the Papacy then came to a great height, but the Church was very corrupt in Doctrine, Worship, Discipline, and Manners, and polluted with spiritual Fornication after Saints, and Angels, and Images, &c. long before that time. So that we may infer, that if the Apostacy came in with the Pope or Papacy, as this did rise to a height, so did the Apostacy from the Truth, then this Character doth agree to the Pope, by which he may be known to be The Antichrist.

2. The second character is the special and most significant expressions applied to Antichrist.

2. The Second Character, by which the Pope is set forth, so as to be known to be Antichrist; 1. He is, ὁ ἀνθρωπος τῆς ἁμαρτίας; ὁ υἱος τῆς ἀπωλείας, v. 3. ὁ ἀντικείμενος, v. 4. ὁ ἄνομος, v. 8. The Man of Sin, the Son of perdition: By an Hebrew phrase expressing one that is a Superlative supereminent sinner, *impietatis coryphæus*, as *Pet. Molin.* phraseth him; As we say a Man of Blood, for a Man thirsting after Blood, or a cruel bloody Man. The Son of Perdition, *perditissimus*, One (by an Hebraism) set upon destruction of others, the most flagitious profligate Sinner, the most inhuman cruel Destroyer, to whom the titles of *Apollyon*, and *Abaddon* do most properly belong; He is actively and passively the Son of Perdition, *Rev.* 17. 8. and 19. 20. He is the great destroyer of Souls, *vers.* 12. He is the ὁ ἀντικείμενος, the great Enemy of all Enemies of Christ, though he is not called by the name of The Antichrist; yet here is a word with the Article prefixed to it, which carrieth the like importance with it. He is the worst and greatest Enemy of Christ, who under a pretence of friendship and love to Christ, doth usurp and undermine his Offices; He appears like a Lamb in his deportment, and speaks like a Dragon, *Rev.* 13. 11. 2. The Papacy is of all other Bodies Politick the worst, being set out with such expressions as have the greatest *Emphasis* in them; It would be too great a business for a Sermon to give you an account of their Tyranny, Cruelty, Luxury, Rapaciousness, Avarice, Blasphemy, Whoredom, Spiritual and Corporal; all the Abominations of the Three former Monarchies do meet in this Fourth, of which the Papacy is the last edition, *Rev.* 13. 2. That Beast set out there is the *Roman* Empire, as Papal not Pagan, as appears by the Crowns on the Horns: But the Pagan Empire had the Crowns on the Heads, *Rev.* 12. 3. Now that wickedness

in

in which those former Empires did excel did meet in the Papal, *Rev.* 13. 2. and therefore it is set out by the Lions mouth, the feet of the Bear, and the Leopard. He is set out in his Type, *Dan.* 11. 28, 30, 31, 32. Or, he himself is set forth (as some think) wholly against the Covenant, expressing an indignation against it with all his might, setting himself against the Sanctuary and daily Sacrifice. *Gruterus* and others understand it of Antichrist, and not of *Antiochus*. The Scripture when it expresseth a person or thing in a signal way, doth it by an affixed article as here, or by an abstract: Here the article sheweth an eminence of wickedness; so the abstract, *Cant.* 1. 4. Heb. *uprightnesses*, by which righteous persons are set forth; so a proud person is set out by pride, *Jer.* 50. 3. we render it, *O you most proud!* So *sin* for a *great sinner*, Prov. 13. 6. So the Man of Sin signifies the most Sinful Man.

He is called the ὁ ἄνομος, v. 8. *That wicked one*, the most lawless one, breaking all bounds and bands, and casting away the cords of Christ, as they, *Psal.* 2. 3. that will not come under the yoke of Christ, nor stoop to his Scepter, that will not that Christ should reign, as *Luk.* 19. 14. This boundless lawless one is therefore set out by a most unruly Beast, *Rev.* 13. 1, 2, &c. and by the Whore of *Babylon*, *Rev.* 17. 1, 2, 3, &c. riding the Beast and making the Kings to commit Fornication with her, and making the Inhabitants of the Earth drunk with the Wine of her Fornication; This is the Mother of Harlots and abominations, drunk with the blood of the Saints and Martyrs, *v.* 5, 6. This the lawless one is the Antichristian state, the Man of Sin under another notion. Lawless, ὁ ἄνομος, as to Scripture, so in point of Doctrine, Worship, Government, and Manners; as to Humane Laws and Powers, being above them all; as to Oaths of Allegiance, &c. as to Exemption of his Clergy, and such like.

If these Epithetes which the Holy Ghost gives to Antichrist, do all belong to the Pope or Papacy, then he may be justly thought to be described in this place.

3. The third particular by which Antichrist is set out is the *place*, *v.* 4. he sitteth in the Temple of God; there he exerciseth his Jurisdiction and Tyranny, and shews himself God, *i.e.* in the Church, the place of the visible external Worship of God, which is called the *outward Court*, *Rev.* 11. 2. which is trod under foot by the Draconizing-beast, or Papacy, profaning the whole Worship of God, and a new Gentilism; therefore the outward Court is cast out, and forbid to be measured in regard that lawless Monster hath brake all bands, and will not come under any Laws and Rules of Christ, therefore they and their Worship are cast out. The place where he sits is called, ναὸς, the Tem-

3. Is the place where he sitteth and resideth. *Philip: Nicolai de Antichristo*, proves the Pope to be Antichrist from this character. See Dr. *Whitaker*, *Danæus*, *Chamier*, *Pet. Molin.* *Junius*, &c. that write of Antichrist, and prove the Pope to be the Antichrist from this place.

ple,

ple or House of Gods Worship. So it is said of the King of *Babylon*, *That he will sit on the Mount of the Congregation*, Isa. 14. 13. *i.e.* Mount *Sion*, the place of Gods Residence and Worship: So here the K. of *Babylon* he takes upon him to sit in the Temple, or Church of God, which is called, ναὸς, *Ephes.* 2. 21. 1 *Cor.* 3. 16. 2 *Cor.* 6. 16. Some will have it for the Temple of *Jerusalem*, that must be the Seat of Antichrist, which is in the power of the *Turk*; but this cannot be, in regard the other Characters will not suit with the *Turks*, but do fall in suitably with the Pope. And so *Jerom* takes the notion of ναὸς, in *Quæst. ad Algesiam*, and *August. de Civit. Dei*, c. 19. he saith, *Rectius dici sessurum in Templum Dei*, εἰς τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, so the Greek; *Tanquam ipse sit Templum Dei quod est Ecclesia:* As we say *in amicum*, i.e. *velut amicus.* This may very well agree with the Papacy, who pretend to be the Holy Catholick and the only True Church. So then the Pope sits in the midst of his Holy Catholick Church of *Rome*, exercising his Tyrannical Power over the people of God; so that *Mahometans* cannot be the Church, they wholly renounce the name of the Church of Christ.

But how can the Antichristian Synagogue where Satans throne is, be called the Temple of God?

Resp. The Scripture speaketh of things as they once were, though they do not continue so to be; and speaks it of persons as they are in pretence and outward profession, though they be not such as they pretend to be. *Abigail* is called the Wife of *Nabal* when he was dead, 1 *Sam.* 30. 5. And *Simon* the Leper though he were healed, *Mat.* 26. 6. so the City that was a Harlot is called the *faithful City*, Isa. 1. 21. It was called the *holy City*, *Joh.* 4. 21. where they worshipped. It was called the *holy place*, *Mat.* 24. 15. till the Desolation by *Vespasian*; and *Mat.* 27. 53. the *holy City*, though they had turned the House of God into a den of thieves, *Mat.* 21. 15. and the City was a bloody City that *killed the Prophets*, Mat. 23. 37. Besides sometime the Scripture speaks of it *quoad opinionem hominum*, as they are reputed by men, 2 *Chron.* 28. 23. *They sacrificed to the gods of* Damascus *that they would help them*; they are called gods on that account; so *Judg.* 10. 13, 14. This Character doth very well agree to the Pope, or Papacy, to prove it to be the Antichristian state here set forth.

The Fourth Character is his Self-exaltation.

4. He is set forth by Self-exaltation: ὑπεραιρόμενος ἐπὶ πάντα λεγόμενον θεὸν; and not only above all that have the title of gods as the Civil Magistrates, *Psal.* 82. 1, 6. Which have the title of gods by virtue of the Authority that God hath invested them withal, *Joh.* 10. 34, 35. But also above the true God, by taking on him to do more than God himself, ἢ σέβασμα, *quicquid est Augustum*, whatsoever is held worthy the highest degree of Civil Reverence as is the Majesty of Kings. *He as God*, he takes on him the Honour due to God himself, and will be adored by the highest Power upon Earth. He that does all this must needs

needs be the Antichrist, but such things doth the Pope; let him look to the conclusion.

Molin. in Vale. c. 6. shews how the Pope is called God, how they plead that he ought so to be, whereof several of their own Writers, especially out of the *Glossa Extravagant. cum Inter.* Which hath these words, *Credere dominum Deum nostrum Papam, conditorem dictæ Decretalis, & ipsius, sic non potuisse statuere ut statuit, hæreticum censeretur.* It is Heretical to believe our Lord God the Pope the maker of the said Decretal not to have power to Decree as he hath decreed. And *Bellarm. l. 1. de Pontif.* saith, (speaking of the Popes Supremacy) *Ecclesia secluso etiam Christo unum caput habere debet*, The Church (secluding Christ) ought to have one Head; this is the Pope which is Oecumenical Bishop. So they attribute the Offices and Excellencies of Christ to the Pope. They say, He is the Father of all Christians, which belongs to Christ, *Isa. 9. 7.* That he is the Teacher of the Church, and the Spouse of the Church, the Foundation of Faith, the Lord of Lords, the chief Corner-stone, universal Judg and Infallible, who is to judg all others, but to be judged of none. These all belong to Christ alone, and he that thus exalts himself, and arrogates these things to himself must needs be Antichrist. *Philip de Nicolai de Antichristo*, shews how the Pope taking all these Titles to himself, proveth that he is Antichrist. As also the Protestant Divines generally prove him to be Antichrist by this Character.

Some go further in this Argument, and shew how the Pope takes on him to do more than God. It is frequent among their Divines and Canonists to say, *Papam posse dispensare contra Apostolum & contra vetus Testamentum.* That the Pope can dispense against the Apostles, and against the Old Testament. That the Pope can make new Simbols. That he can dispense with things forbidden of God. *Bel. l. 4. de Pœnitent. c. 13.* saith, *Indulgentiæ faciunt, ut pro iis pœnis quæ nobis per indulgentias condonantur, non teneamur præcepto illo, de faciendis dignis pœnitentiæ fructibus*; That as to those penalties from which we are freed by Indulgences, we are not bound to bring forth fruits worthy of repentance. Nay he goes further, *Lib. 4. de Summo Pont. c. 5. Si Papa erraret præcipiendo vitia, vel prohibendo virtutes, teneretur Ecclesia credere vitia esse bona, & virtutes malas, nisi vellet contra conscientiam peccare*; If the Pope should err so as to command vices, and forbid virtues, the Church would be bound to believe vices to be good and virtues to be evil, unless she will sin against Conscience.

Thus blasphemously do they speak of the Supereminence of the Pope above God himself; and as for all Civil Powers he is absolutely free from them, and much above them all, *Vid. text. Decret. dist. 96. c. 7. Satis evidenter ostenditur a seculari potestate non solvi prorsus nec ligari Pontificem posse, quem constat a Constantino Deum appellatum, cum nec Deum ab hominibus judicari manifestum sit*; Since the Pope is god, therefore he cannot either be bound, or loosed by men. Their words are in the body of the Canon-Law set forth by the command of *Gregory 13.*

Anc.

An. 1591. "From this it appears that the Pope is above Scripture, Coun-" cils, Princes, and all Powers upon Earth, upon the account of his Di-" vinity It is common amongst them at least to equalize the Popes Decrees to the Holy Scripture; and that the Popes Decretals are to be accounted Canonical; and that the Popes Determinations are to be preferred above the Scripture; with many such like blasphemies. See *Decret. cum glossa ed. Tug.* Ann. 1510. *Dist.* 19. & *c.* 6. *Dist.* 40. And which is worst of all, they assert the Scriptures are inferiour to the Popes Decrees. *Ut fidem non facere, neq; necessitatem credendi inducere queant, nisi Papa per canonizationem quam vocant, iis authoritatem prius impertiat*, Decret. *l.* 2. *tit.* 23. *de presumptionibus*, *chap.* 1. That the Scriptures have no Authority so as to procure belief of them, unless they can be first canonized by the Pope. It is no wonder though the Pope uttereth such Blasphemies, since he is the Head of that Idolatrous Beast full of Blasphemies, *Rev*, 13. 5, 6.

Since they will have the Pope to be such a Supream Head to the Church militant, as Christ *Quoad influxum interiorem*, so he *quoad influxum exteriorem Doctrinæ & fidei*, Bel. *l.* 2. *de Concil. authoritate*, *c.* 15. Since they will have him not only to be equal with Christ, but above him; he being able to redeem Souls out of Purgatory, which Christ never did, and is affirmed by them: *Joh. Turrecremata* and others that licensed the Revelations of *Bridget*, they let go that passage in that Book, *Bonus Gregorius oratione sua, etiam infidelem Cæsarem elevavit ad altiorem gradum.* By which it appears that the Pope hath done that which Christ never did; and that the Popes Charity is larger than Christs, who prayed not for the World, *Joh.* 17. 6. but the Pope prays for the Damned. Since I say, they will have their Pope with all these prodigious Blasphemies, since they will have their Lord God the Pope thus lifting up his Head above Lucifer, let them have him, and believe his Lies and Impostures; since they reject the Truth whereby *they might be saved, let them believe his Lies that they may be damned*, v. 10, 11. *Qui Satanam non odit amet tua dogmata Papa.*

The Fifth Character by which Antichrist is known, Is the taking out of the way that which hindered.

5. *Antichrist* is set forth by the *removens prohibens*, by the taking that which hindred out of the way; the τὸ κατέχον, v. 6. and ὁ κατέχων ἐκ μέσου γένηται, v. 7. There was something that hindred the Revelation of the Man of Sin, which was to be removed. The Man of Sin could not be brought forth into the World till the *Roman* Empire was taken out of the way, then that wicked One the Pope did rise up to that height, then Antichrist did appear in his colours. There is a great consent among the Ancients as to this thing; and *Jerome* was so clear and confident in this thing, that as soon as he heard of the taking of *Rome* by *Alarick*, he presently expected the coming of Antichrist. See *Tertul. l.* 4. *de Resur. c.* 24. *Ambros. in Comment. in Ezek. Chrysost. Com. in loc. August. l.* 19. *de Civ. Dei*, *c.* 20. Among the Ancients they were so confident of this thing that the Church did pray in her Liturgy, That the *Roman* Empire

Empire might ſtand long, that ſo Antichriſts coming might be long; *Tertullian Apolog.* c.32. 39. So that the *Roman* Empire or Emperour, who was then in poſſeſſion of that Power Imperial, kept out that Papal power which grew out of its Ruins. Κατέχειν, is the ſame as *Poſſidere*, 1 Cor. 7. 30. οἱ ἀγοράζοντες, ὡς μὴ κατέχοντες, the *Roman* Empire being broken into Ten Kingdoms brought in Antichriſt; ſo *Tertul. l.4. de Reſurrect. c.24. Paul* did not expreſs the *Roman* Empire by name leſt he ſhould bring a Perſecution upon the Church. *Jerom ad Algaſiam, qu.*11. *Pet. in Molin. Vale.* ſhews in ſeveral Inſtances how the *Roman* Emperours did keep the Biſhop of *Rome* from growing to that height, as he did upon their being removed out of the way.

Others take it to be meant of the *Roman* Emperour himſelf, and not of the *Roman* Empire at all; for the *Roman* is not taken out of the way. but ſtands on two legs, *viz.* the Empire of *Turks*, and the Empire of *Germany*. It was the Emperour himſelf, which was *Conſtantine* the Great, who removed to *Conſtantinople*, then the τὸ κατέχον was taken away, The Grandeur of the Emperour and of Antichriſt could not ſtand together. Aſſoon as the Emperour departed from *Rome*, Antichriſt began to be revealed. For when all the Biſhops in the Chriſtian World did meet at the Council of *Nice*, the Biſhop of *Rome* (though requeſted by a Letter) came not, he pretended old age, and the weakneſs of his Body: But *Bellarmine* telleth us the true reaſon was, it was not meet the Head ſhould follow the Members, but rather that the Members ſhould follow the Head; and if the Emperour were preſent, it is likely he would ſit above the Pope, which was not meet, he being the Spiritual Head; therefore he did abſent himſelf. *Cotton* on 1 *Joh.* 2. 18. Though they differ as to the Emperour and Empire, to be that which hindred, yet they agree as to the Pope, that he roſe to his height upon the removal of the one or the other out of the way.

6. By the notion of a Myſtery, as it ſtands in oppoſition to the *Myſtery of Godlineſs*, v.7. the Apoſtle following the *Hebrew* way of expreſſion, μυστήριον τῆς ἀνομίας, i.e. *Doctrina improba vel Myſterium improbum*, a wicked Doctrine or Myſtery; for the whole Religion of Popery as to Faith and Worſhip is ſo contrived by them as may moſt conduce to the ſuſtaining and advancement of the Popes Power, and the gain and profit of the Clergy; There we find that to be written in the forehead of the Whore, (*Rev.* 17. 5.) μυστήριον, as a principal part of her Name. Such is the helliſh contrivance of the whole Body of the Religion of the Papacy, (in which Satan never ſhewed himſelf ſo notorious an Impoſtor, and Angel of Darkneſs, though under the appearance of an Angel of Light) that it gained upon the whole World exceedingly by the Pope, Satans Vicar, ſet forth by the Lamb with two Horns, *Rev.* 13. 11. Who hath prevailed with all ſorts of men to receive the Mark of the Beaſt, and bow to his Image; v.12, 13, 14. The Religion of Antichriſt is carried on in a ſubtle cunning way, elſe it

6. By the Myſtery of Iniquity which doth attend his riſe and reign.

could not be called a Myſtery, and a Myſtery of Iniquity under the pretence of Godlineſs; the great factors in this Myſtery are ſaid to be ſeducers that ſpeak Lies in hypocriſie, 1 *Tim.* 4. 1, 2. *who have* μόρφωσιν, *a form of piety*, which is the mantle to cover the blackeſt abominations, 2 *Tim.* 3. 1, 5. And *Peter* ſpeaking of ſuch Myſtical Villanies, 2 *Pet.* 2. 1, 2, 3. tells us how privily they ſhould bring in damnable Hereſies under the colour of truth. The Religion of Popery which is meerly to advance the honour and grandeur, profit and intereſt of the Pope and his Hierarchy, under a pretence of ſetting up the name and honour of Chriſt, have by their Myſtical art, and cunning fair plauſible deportment, undermined and overthrown the Religion of Chriſt up and down the World. *Chamier l.16. c.8.* treating about Antichriſt, and ſhewing how by their cunning, Hereſies are made ſubſervient to him; ſaith thus, *Hæc vero ſi aliqua eſt Antichriſti nota; dicam audacter, aut nullum eſſe Antichriſtum, aut Epiſcopum Rom. eum eſſe:* This is a ſpecial note of Antichriſt; I'le ſpeak boldly, That either there is no Antichriſt, or the Biſhop of *Rome* is he.

7. By the Stupendious manner of his coming.

7. *By the manner of his coming*, v. 9, 10. his coming, *i.e.* after he is revealed, and that which hindred is taken out of the way; his coming together with the influences that it had on the World, and ſuch as periſh. He cometh κατ' ἐνέργειαν τῦ Σατανᾶ, *i.e.* Satan will put forth his utmoſt skill in working Miracles by Antichriſt. 2. ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει, καὶ σημείοις, *i. e.* his power to work after a wonderful manner, which God is pleaſed ſometime to grant even to the worſt of men. He ſhall work Signs or Miracles, for Signs are taken ſo here. 3. *Omnis potentia* it is to be taken for *varia potentia*, or a power to work variouſly. 4. Τέρασι ψευδῦς, an *Hebraiſm*, according to the letter *prodigiis mendacii*, lying wonders, or wonderful lies. 5. καὶ ἐν πάσῃ ἀπάτῃ τῆ ἀδικίας, ἐν pro μετὰ vel διὰ, *with all deceivableneſs of unrighteouſneſs*; there is a double *Hebraiſm* ſaith *Piſcator*, *Unus in ſignificatione Synecdochica vocabuli injuſtitiæ pro falſitate ſeu mendacio; alter in uſu nominis ejuſdem, quod, cum ſubſtantivum ſit, hic vim habet epitheti.* Under the name of unrighteouſneſs is covered all manner of falſhood and lies, by which they do deceive many, and would deceive the very Elect if they could, *Mat.* 24. 24. Then 5. ἐνέργεια τῆς πλάνης, for πλάνη ἐνέργειας, *i.e.* ἐνεργυσάν, *Hypallage Heb.* We render *ſtrong deluſion*, or the *deluſion of Antichriſt working ſtrongly*, ſpecially coming under a Judicial tradition from God. This Advent or coming of Antichriſt here mentioned is not to be referred to his firſt Revelation only, but to his full Revelation, when his Kingdom and Government ſhall be ſet up in its ſplendor and power.

He ſhall come with all the power of Satan. Satan is moſt famous for two things, he is *Mordax & homicida*, Joh. 8.44. for he is an adverſary to Divine Authority, and Mans Salvation; and both theſe are eminently ſeen in the Pope, for he hath brought in falſe Doctrines, falſe Worſhip,

ship, and a false Religion into the Church; and by this means he is the great murderer of Souls, for they are damned that follow his Delusions, as appears in the Text. Satan shews himself a lyar when he puts men on a false Idolatrous Worship instead of a true; so all Idolaters are lyars, *Rom.* 1.25. *They changed the truth of God into a lie, &c.* and therefore Idols are called lies, *Amos* 2.4. so Idolaters are said, *to make lies their refuge, as under falshood to hide themselves.* But Satan never did impose such a lye on the World as in the Idolatrous Worship of *Rome*; there Idolaters and Lyars are put together, *Rev.* 21.8. and 27. he that worketh abymination and a lye, they are put together; and *Chap.* 22. 15. Idolaters and makers of lyes are put together again.

Cum omni potentia; some take it of the power of both Swords, Ecclesiastical and Secular, which the Pope claims, but it rather respecteth that faculty and power which the Pope the two Horned-Beast, *Rev.* 13. 12, 13, *&c.* doth pretend to, and whereby he doth work Wonders: The Signs and Wonders here spoken of, are the ways and means, and weapons which Satan useth by Antichrist to deceive persons to their destruction; this was the way which Satan took by *Jannes* and *Jambres* to deceive *Pharaoh* and the *Egyptians*, 2 *Tim.* 3.8. these were a kind of types of Seducers which were to come in these last times.

That this may appear to be a Character of Antichrist, the Papists themselves do grant that Antichrist is to be confirmed with Signs and Wonders, *Suarez Apol. lib.* 1. *c.* 17. *num.* 12. *Bellarm. de Pont. Rom. l.* 3. *c.* 15. *Sanders de Antichristo, Dem.* 19, 20, 21, 22. If then the Popes coming be by Signs and lying Wonders, then he will come under that mark of Antichrist by their own confessions.

That Miracles have been at the first promulgation of the Scripture is most true for the confirmation of the Divine Authority of it, & increasing a belief of the Doctrine of Christ; but after that the Gospel is promulgated, there is no further use of Miracles: And therefore when the Scripture doth speak of Miracles and Miracle-mongers as here; and *Mar.* 13.22. and *Rev.* 13.13. *Mat.* 7.22. it is to be understood of false Christs and false Prophets, who shall come in the name of Christ, and shall pretend to marvelous things in his name, and shall deceive many, and this is here brought in as a special mark of Antichrist.

That this Mark is fulfilled in the Papacy, doth appear from themselves, who boast very much of their Miracles, and the advancement of their Religion, and the confirmation of it by Miracles. The Legends of their Saints are full of Miracles, of St. *Dominick*, St. *Francis*, Saint *Benedict*, and the Images of the Virgin *Mary*, and other Saints in their Calendar; such Miracles are called lying Miracles: 1. Because they are for the confirmation of false Doctrines, of Transubstantiation, Purgatory, Invocation of Saints, Adoration of Images, and Relicks, &c. Prayers for the Dead, and the Popes Supremacy, &c. 2. Because many of them are things meerly feigned to be done which were never

done, or if they were done, they have been brought about by the meer artifice of Satan, who is able to do things beyond the reach of men, by which he deceives such as will be deceived. 3. From the end of these Miracles which is to deceive men, *Mar.* 13.22. and here in the Text they are framed by seducers for seduction, and such as will not receive the truth with that love of it: v.1. *They came with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish.*

Their own Authors have set down multitudes of Miracles: *Baron.* in his *Annals*: The conformities of St. *Francis*, the Golden Legend of *Jacobus de Voragine*, the Sermons of *Dormi secure*, the History of our Lady by *Lipsius*, and *Bellarm. de Officio Principis*, *l.* 3. with several others. So that by all this you see this note will agree to the Antichristian state of the Papacy.

8. By his fatal Ruin.

8. *He is set out by his fatal ruin, and utter destruction*, v.8. Here be two parts of this verse. 1. The first looks back on the verse before, which speaks of the time of Antichrists coming upon the removal of what hindred; this we have done with. But 2. this latter part points at the ruin of Antichrist, and how he shall be destroyed. The former part had respect to our Instruction, the latter is for our Consolation in the downfall of so great and publick an Enemy.

He sets down the principal efficient cause of his ruin, and that is Christ at his coming: when Christ comes to set up his Kingdom, and to take to him his great Power and Reign, then he will destroy Antichrist; *Dan.* 2.44. & 7.14,28. specially under the fifth, sixth, and seventh Vials, *Rev.* 16. from *v.* 10. to the end. You have the destruction of the Whore, *chap.* 18. the overthrow of the Beast and false Prophet, *ch.*19. from 17. to the end; then you have the binding of Satan and the reign of the Saints on the Earth, *ch.* 20. 1, 2, *&c.*

2. You have the instrumental cause, *the spirit of his mouth.* Here be two words to be considered, 1. Ἀναλώσει, *consumere*; which notes his gradual consumption by the preaching of the Gospel, *Isa.* 11. 4. this is the Sword out of his mouth, *Rev.* 19. 15. By this Sword Christ doth smite the Nations; his consumption is gradual as was his rising, which was under the Trumpets, and his fall is under the Vials: the Preachers of the Gospel have been wasting, wounding and consuming him, specially since the Angels with open mouth did declare against him, *Rev.* 14. 6, 7, 8, 9. The Ministers of the Gospel since the Reformation began, have discovered the Whoredoms, Impostures, and false Doctrines of *Rome*, and the danger of having communion with *Rome*, and the desperate condition of such as will not separate from her, *v.*9,10. Many a deadly wound have they given to Antichrist; so that he hath been wasting like a Snail, as *Psal.* 58. 8. till he shall come to nothing; not by might, nor by power, *Rev.* 4. 6, 7. but by the Word which he hath pretended to rise by, he shall be destroyed. 2. Here is καταργήσει, which notes his utter destruction, by the brightness of Christs coming, when he

he shall come to take to him his great Power, at the sounding of the seventh Trumpet, *Rev.* 11. 15. The Text must be considered under a double Capacity; 1, As to his Ecclesiastical state, and in his Spiritual Capacity as he is set forth under the notion of a Whore, and false Prophet, and so shall be consumed by the preaching of the Word, and the Sword of the Spirit; and this hath been doing these many years, and the work is still carrying on by the Ministers of the Word. 2. He must be considered in his Politick Secular Capacity, consisting of several Kingdoms under one supream Head, which is the Pope; so he is set out by the notion of the Beast, *Rev.* 11. 7. & *ch.* 13. 1, 2, 3. which Beast, the Whore, *i.e.* the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy of *Rome* rideth, *Rev.* 17. 3. yet they both together make up but one Antichrist, as the Horse and Man both together makes up but one Horseman. Now Antichrist as to his Secular Capacity, he shall be destroyed with another Sword, *Rev.* 13. 10. *He that killeth with the sword shall be killed with the sword.* So that the utter consumption both of the Beast and Whore shall be upon the little stones rising into a great Mountain, which shall smite the Image on his feet, and shall break it to pieces, *Dan.* 2. 34, 35. This little stone is the Kingdom of Christ, which hath been but *Regnum Lapidis* hitherto, but then shall be *Regnum Montis*.

Perhaps it will be said, That the destruction of Antichrist (as hath been shewed) can be no mark of Antichrist, by which he may be known, for all Enemies shall be destroyed by Christ and by his Word.

It is true that Christ will destroy all his Enemies by his Word which cometh out of his mouth, *Rev.* 19. 15. Sin and the Devil are continually destroying by the Word; but since Antichrist is set forth as the greatest enemy that ever was, and since the Antichristian state of it as it is in the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy of *Rome*, together with the Beast, *Rev.* 13. 1, 2, *&c.* are the last edition of the Fourth Monarchy, and it is on its last legs in this state, and it hath most opposed the Kingdom of Christ beyond any other; therefore the destruction of this State as to the remarkableness of it shall go beyond all other States and Kingdoms in the World. And therefore it is, that the Vials are prepared for this Enemy in a more special manner beyond all others, *Rev.* 15. 1, 2, *&c.* and *ch.* 16. the seven Angels with the seven Vials pour them forth upon the Beast, or something of the Beast. Thus much hath been made good in the Papacy in a great measure already, which may appear by the confession of *Bellarmine*, who telleth us, (*Lib. Pont. de Rom.* 3. *c.*21.) That the *Lutheran* Heresie possessed almost all *Germany*, *Denmark*, *Norway*, *Suevia*, *Gothia*, *Hungaria*, *Pannonia*, *France*, *England*, *Scotland*, *Polonia*, *Bohemia*, and *Helvetia*, and is got over the *Alps* into *Italy*. From his confession you may perceive what a Consumption there hath been made of Antichrist.

9. Antichrist may be known by his Followers, and the Livery which they wear, the black marks and brands upon their backs, *v.* 10, 11, 12.

9. By his Followers and Retinue, and their Livery.

Here

Here is a damned crew, the Retinue and Followers of Antichriſt, having this ſpecial mark on them, that they be ſuch as ſhall periſh. Their Properties are 1. Negative, *They received not the love of the truth that they might be ſaved.* 2. Affirmative, *they have pleaſure in unrighteouſneſs.* 3. They are ſet forth by ſome paſſive Properties which are penalties. 1. Internal, *v.* 11. *ſtrong deluſions to believe a lye.* 2. Eternal, *v.* 12. *Damnation*; here be the black marks of Reprobation, by which Antichriſts Retinue and Followers are ſet forth. We do not find that any party of men are under more dreadful marks of Gods hatred than Antichriſts Followers. See *Rev.* 13. 8. there they be ſet out by the Stigma of Reprobation, as perſons left out of the Book of Life. And *chap.* 14. 9, 10, 11. *They that worſhip the Beaſt, and receive his mark in their forehead, and in their hand, they ſhall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, &c. and be tormented with fire and brimſtone, &c.* And *chap.* 17. 8. there the admirers of the Beaſt are ſuch as are left out of the Book of Life: The ſame perſons are deſcribed here by *Paul.* 4. They are ſet forth by a ſpecial act of God in a way of juſt Judgment toward them; *i.e.* his ſending ſtrong Deluſions to believe lies, by a Judicial Tradition, and giving of them up to a ſpirit of falſhood to their eternal perdition. All theſe which are followers of Antichriſt, that wonder after the Beaſt, and receive his mark, and bow to his Image, who cloſe with Popiſh falſe Doctrines inſtead of the true; the Holy Spirit expreſſeth them by ἐκ ἔδεξαντο, *v.* 10. i.e. *Pertinaciter oblatum repudiarunt; eſt Meiωſis*, Beza. They are ſuch as wilfully reject the true Doctrine and Worſhip of Chriſt, and pertinaciouſly adhere to the falſe Doctrine, and the Idolatrous Worſhip of the Pope: And moreover they pleaſe themſelves much in thoſe falſe ways of unrighteouſneſs, which are moſt deſtructive to Souls, and moſt diſpleaſing to God.

From all this it appears that the Pope is Antichriſt. Indeed if but ſome one or few Particulars did meet on the Pope or Papacy, we could not argue from them that he were the Antichriſt, but when they all meet in the Papacy, and generally by common conſent of Orthodox Writers they faſten theſe marks upon the Pope, he will never be able by all the skill he hath to eſcape the vengeance of God which will follow him on that account. Dr. *Whitaker* writing againſt Antichriſt, and proving the Pope to be the Antichriſt, he names many eminent and learned men that have underſtood this place, and thoſe others in *Daniel* and the *Revelation*, of the Pope. He tells us of *Wicklife* (who declared the Pope to be Antichriſt) who was *ſuo ſeculo doctiſſimus.* And *Luther* affirms in his Writings the Pope to be Antichriſt: He ſaith he is *potiſſimus Antichriſtus*, and that abomination of Deſolation that ſtands in the Holy place. *Papa ille eſt Antichriſtus, cum ſit ſpecialis procurator Diaboli, &c. Non ſolum ſimplex illa perſona, ſed multitudo paparum a tempore defectionis Eccleſiæ, Cardinalium, Epiſcoporum, & ſuorum complurium aliorum, eſt Antichriſti perſona compoſita, monſtroſa, &c.* Catalog. Teſtium Verit. He adds that

that he was a man, *Spiritu Prophetico & dono interpretandi Scripturas preditus admirabili.* Then followed *Peter Martyr*, *Bucer*, *Bullinger*, *Melancton*, *Brentius*, *Calvin*, *Oecolampadius*, *Musculus*, *Beza*, *Gualter*, *Illyricus*, *Danus*, *Junius*, *Gabriel Powæol*, *Philip Morney*, *George Pacardus* in *Descriptione Antichristi*, *Catalogus Testium Veritatis*, *Rivet*, *Crakenthorp*, *Tilenus*, *Chamier*, Bishop *Usher* in a Letter to Archbishop *Laud*, 1635. All agree in this Thesis, That the Pope is Antichrist. And *Zanchy* though he differed somewhat from his Brethren in this point, yet he saith in his *Miscellanies*, *Regnum Papæ*, *non nego esse Regnum Antichristi.* And he thinks that the Pope is pointed in 2 *Thes.* 2. As for our *English* men we have many that have publickly testified the Pope to be Antichrist, as Mr. *Fox* in his *Martyrology* hath noted. The learned Martyr *Walter Brute* maintained it in a large Discourse. *Richard Wimbleton* in a Sermon preached at *Pauls* Cross 1389. Sir *Geofry Chaucer* in his Plow-mans Tale. *Lucifers* Letters to the Prelats of *England*, supposed to be written by *William Swinderly* Martyr. *William Tyndal* a godly Martyr in his *Obedience of a Christian man.* The Author of a *very Christian Bishop and a counterfeit Bishop*, 1538. *John Bale* Bishop of *Osyris* in his *Image of both* Churches, *& templorum illustriam Britanniæ.* Mr. *Latimer*, Mr. *Bilney*, Mr. *Rogers*, *Sletterdon* and others, Martyrs. *William Abbey* Bishop of *Exeter* in his poor mans Library. Bishop *Jewel* in his Defence of the Apology of the Church of *England.* Mr. *Tho. Beacon* in his Acts of Christ and Antichrist, and Mr. *Fox* in his Meditations on the *Apocalypsis.* Mr. *Brightman* on the *Apocalypsis.* Bishop *Bilson* in his Book of Christian Subjection, and Unchristian Rebellion. Dr. *Robert Abbot* Bishop of *Sarum*, Dr. *George Downham* Bishop of *Derry*, Dr. *Beard*, Dr. *Willet*, Dr. *Fulk*, Dr. *Sutcliffe*, Dr. *Sharp*, Mr. *Squire*, in their several Treatises concerning Antichrist: Archbishop *Cranmer* did avow publickly the Pope to be Antichrist: Archbishop *Parker* and *Grindal* avowed the same: Archbishop *Whitgift* when he Commenced Doctor at the Divinity-Act 1569, publickly maintained in the Schools, that *Papa est ille Antichristus:* And Archbishop *Abbot* asserted the same, with many others of our *English* Divines, who have generally held and declared the Pope to be Antichrist.

Haud equidem credo quemquam justum esse bonumque. Cui Papa non fordet manifestus ut Antichristus.

I might add the Convocation in *Ireland* 1615, the Parliament of *England* 3 *Jacobi*; the Synod of *Gape* in *France*, several Statutes of 16 *R.* 2. *c.* 5; 25 *Hen.* 8. *c.* 19, 20, 21, 28. *Hen.* 8. *c.* 10. 37. *Hen.* 8. 17. they tacitely define the Pope to be the Antichrist. Then our Book of Homilies, second part in the Sermon for *Whitesunday*; and in the sixth Sermon against wilful Rebellion determine the Pope to be Antichrist. The Book of Common-Prayer for the Fifth of *November*, stileth the Pope, Papists, and Jesuits a *Babylonish*, Antichristian Sect. The Author of the Book called *Eusebius Captivus*, who declared against the Pope as the Antichrist to his face, when he was brought before him to be arraigned. *Archusius de ortu Antichristi*, *Philip Nicolai*, *Christopher. Peret.*

Penser:

Peucer, &c. have fastened the title of Antichrist on the Pope. We find in story several times loud out-crys of the birth of Antichrist, and still their eyes were upon the Pope. *An.* 1106. *Prepergentis* tells us that Pope *Paschalis* was going a Journey into *France* there to hold a Council, and he heard in his Journey, that it was the common report that Antichrist was born; whereupon he stops his Journey and staid at *Florence*, but afterwards he went his Journey, despising the report, as coming from contemptible fellows: Though *Baronius* tells us, They were persons of no ordinary note who did report it. See *Bernard* Epist. 56. *ad Gaud. fridum. Carnoteus*, *Epist. Sabellic. Ennead. 9. c.4.* tells us of Prodigies that appeared about that time in the Heavens, a Camel of vast magnitude, and in the Sea which over-flowed the shore an hundred paces: thereupon it was that the Bishop of *Florence* said, that Antichrist was born then in the year 1120: There was a Treatise set forth in the name of some faithful servants of Christ concerning Antichrist, in which all persons are awakened to consider of Antichrist, which was manifest in their age in the Pope and Papacy; thereupon many did separate from the Church of *Rome*: See *Bernard* Hom. 65, 66, in *Cant.* Between the year 1160, and 1170, the world being awakened as with a publick Herald sounding a Trumpet about Antichrists then appearing, caused a very great separation of the *Waldenses* and *Albigenses* from the Church of *Rome*. By all these Testimonies it appears what a general agreement there is and hath been among all that have had a savour of the true Religion upon their hearts; they have still agreed in this, though they have differed in other points, That the Pope is Antichrist.

From what hath been said there be several things may be drawn by way of Inference, for our practice and instruction.

1 *Infer:* From what hath been said we may see a reason of the mistakes of some in their proving the Man of Sin to be the Antichrist, and the Pope to be the Man of Sin, from some places which do not so properly belong to it. They have thought the same Antichrist to be pointed at in *Johns* Epistles, 1 *Joh.* 2: 18, 22. and 1 *Joh.* 4. 3: and 2 *Joh.* 7: as here in *Pauls* Epistle to the *Thessalonians*: Some think the same Antichrist to be set forth by *John*, as by *Daniel*, and *Paul*, and by *John* in the *Revelations*, who deciphers Antichrist under the notion of a Beast, and a Whore, and a false Prophet. The Antichrist pointed at by *John* in his Epistles hath relation rather to the prediction of Christ, *Mat.* 24. 11, 23, 24. *Mar.* 13. 21, 22. *There shall arise false Christs, &c.* We have not the name Antichrist but only in *John*, indeed we have ὁ ἀντικειμενος *v.4.* a word equivalent: *John* speaks of an Antichrist who was then in the World, and one propheſied of by Christ to come speedily into the World. But *Paul* writes of one who was wholly to come into the World, and for whose coming there were great obstacles to be removed first.

first. The Antichrists coming in *John* is immediately upon a time which is called ἐσχάτη ὥρα, 1 *Joh.* 2.18. And we know that since he is come, it is the last hour or last time. This cannot refer to the last time which respecteth the coming of Christ to judg the World: This last hour doth refer to the Jewish state, of which the last glass or hour was now running and their final desolation was at hand. Then there were several who did pretend to be Christ, and to come in his name; there was *Simon Magus*, and *Carpocrates*, and the *Gnosticks*, of whom they were the heads which did pretend to *Miracles*, and *Enthusiasms*, and did seduce many. These be the Antichrists *John* speaks of in his Epistles, which were to appear, at the Coming of the Lord to Judgment; I do not mean his last Coming to the Judgment of the World, but of his Coming to the final destruction of *Jerusalem*, and the Jewish Polity and Nation by *Vespasian:* of which Coming *Paul* speaks, *Heb.* 10. 25. That was the day approaching in which Christ came to destroy that people: It is mentioned by *James* 5. 7, 8. which did draw nigh, for then the Lord Jesus was coming against *Jerusalem.* From the misunderstanding of these places, and misapplying them to wrong purposes, hath arisen the misapprehensions of the Pope's being Antichrist; for though several things in those places in *John*'s Epistles do agree to the Papacy, yet the proper description of Antichrist is to be looked after in *Pauls* Epistle to the *Thessalonians*, *&c.* and in the *Revelation*, and in *Daniel.*

2 *Infer.* If the Pope be The Antichrist set forth by those bloody characters (as hath been seen); if this Body Politick, Head and Members, be the Antichristian state, and this state is the Papacy, then it cannot be the true Church: It is true, Antichrist, Head and Members, are the counterfeit of the true Church, and of Christ the Head, and therefore they cannot be the true Church. The Scripture still sets out the Antichristian state in a flat opposition to the true, yet still under a pretence and colour of Faith in, and Love to Christ: For Antichristianism is, *mystica impietas, pietatis nomine palliata:* A mystical impiety, under the cloke of piety; so the *Glos.* The false Church whereof the Pope is the Head, is set forth by a double Beast, *Rev.* 13. 1, 2,---11, 12. Both which together make up one Catholick Roman Papal Church, the number of whose name is *666*, *vers.* 18. And the true Church, whereof Christ is the Head, is set forth by 144000, *chap.* 14. 1. the Square-root being 12. built on 12 Apostles: But 25 is the Square-root of *666*, and there is a Fraction in the Root, and one more too there in the Square-root; to let us know, that though the Antichristian Church may seem as fair to such as look on it with human eyes, and *666*, runs as handsomly as 144; but the former is the number of a Man, the whole Church and her Religion, being made up of additions and inventions of men. The number *666*, denotes the Apostacy of the Church from the Standard of Truth. The Square-root of the Apostolick Church being 12, and so the Apostacy lies generally in additions to the Root and Foundation of

Mr. *Potter* in his *666.*

the Christian Religion; they do not rest satisfied in fundamentals of the Christian Religion delivered by the 12 Apostles. The false Church is set forth by the Whore, who pretends to be the Spouse of Christ, but is opposite to the Virgin-company, *Rev.* 14. 4. that follow the Lamb. The Ecclesiastical state of *Rome*, or Hierarchy, is set forth by the false Prophet, *Rev.* 16. 13, &c. 19. 20. & 20. 10. in a flat opposition to the two Prophets, *Rev.* 11. 10. which are the same with two Witnesses, and two Olive-trees, and two Candlesticks, *vers.* 3, 4. These represent the true Ministry of Christ which did propheſie, *vers.* 6. till they finished their Testimony, *vers.* 7. Now whereas it is said that they are a true Church, *veritate entitativa*, but not *Moris*; they yield the Cause, because the question is not whether they be true and real men and women which are members of the Church of *Rome*; but whether they be members rightly qualified, as to their moral, and supernatural Principles which makes them a true Church?

How can that be a true Church, whose Head is the Man of Sin, &c. who hath all those black and hellish characters belonging to him? Such a Church cannot be founded on the 12 Apostles; Therefore that cannot be a true Church, which hath the *Abaddon* and *Apollyon* for the Heads. How can that be a true Church, which is so opposite to the true Church both Head and Members?

3. *Inference.* If the Papal Antichristian state, be such a Body, Head and Members (as hath been shewed) then we may hence learn, 1. our Danger, 2. our Duty. 1. Our Danger if we continue in that Church. It must needs be a very dangerous thing for any to continue a member of that Church, or to have Communion with her: Such are under the energetical Influence and Seduction of Satan, and the Judicial Tradition of God, that since they reject the truth in the love of it, they are given up to believe a lye, that they may be damned. They are under the most dreadful commination, *Rev.* 14. 9, 10, 11. They are a people marked out for utter destruction, as being rejected by him, *Rev.* 13. 8, and 17. 8. 2. We may learn our Duty to make haste out of that Church. All such as keep up Communion with *Rome*, let them hearken to that Call, *Rev.* 18. 4. *Come out of her, &c.* The Argument is taken from the Danger; this separation is no Schism, it being a separation from that Church, which is Apostatized from the Faith, and Truth of Christ. As soon as ever the people of God came to be awakened, and that the light of the Gospel began to spring forth, they presently saw their danger if they continued in that Church, and immediately performed their duty, and departed from her.

4. *Inference.* If the Papal Antichristian state be such a Body as hath been shewed, then it should be seriously considered, how any living and dying in the Faith and Religion of that Church can be saved, *Rev.* 16. 3. Every living Soul died in that *Sea* of Ordinances (as some take it) of that Church, which is *as the Blood of a dead man*, as it

was (*Exod.* 7. 17, 18.) when the Rivers were turned into Blood, all the Fish died. The whole Religion of the Antichristian Church is made up of false Doctrines, idolatrous Worship, superstitious Ceremonies, Traditions, and Inventions of men, by which they make void the Law of God, *Matt.* 15. 6. and subvert the Truth of the Gospel. How any (holding their Religion as it is so formed by the Man of Sin) can be saved in it, I cannot see. In all the description of the Man of Sin, the Son of Perdition, there is nothing that hath any tendency to Salvation: Look on the Church of *Rome* and her Hierarchy as she is set forth by the Spirit of God, and it is still set forth in the most black and odious colours of a Beast with seven Heads and ten Horns, and by a Beast with two Horns like a Lamb, but speaks like a Dragon; *Rev.* 13. 1, 2, & 11, 12, &c. And by the great Whore that rideth the Beast, *Rev.* 17. 1, 2, and 5, 6. Here is nothing but mischief and ruine to Souls from this Church, as set out by those Types, as also under the notion of a false Prophet, and Seducer of the Souls of people to their Perdition. Some of the Church of *Rome* have much doubted, whether the Pope and Cardinals (which are the Head and Pillars of their Church) shall any of them be saved. *Boccatius* brings in a Monk saying thus: *Papas & Cardinales, & Episcopos non pervenire ad salutem per doctrinam istam, quam palam videmus, eos servare; sed aliam habere penes se, quam clanculum observant, nec aliis facile communicant: quid potuit verius dici, eos per istam, quæ illis est in usu, non posse servari.* *Boccatius* himself, looks on the Pope, and Cardinals, and Bishops, according to the Doctrine they held forth to the World, as persons which shall never be saved; unless as the Monk saith, they have some other Doctrine which they keep to themselves, in which they look for Salvation: He on all their Religion to be a meer Shew and Pageantry, and refined Paganism. I'le propound but an Argument or two to confirm this *Inference.*

1. They which lay the main stress of their Religion, on the rotten foundation of the Universal Headship of the Pope, and do believe it as an Article of their Faith, they cannot build their eternal Salvation upon such a weak foundation; there being no other foundation but that which is laid, Christ Jesus, 1 *Cor.* 3. 11, 12. But so do they of the Church of *Rome*, they built their Religion on this foundation of the Headship of the Pope, to whom they give what peculiarly belongs to Christ, with Supremacy, Soveraignty, Universality, and Infallibility. They which rob Christ of his Crown and Jewels, and put them on the Popes *triple* Crown for him to wear, and lay the greatest weight on this business, they cannot be saved while they rest there; But so do the Papists: Therefore, &c. *The Pope sits in the temple of God, as God,* 2 *Thes.* 2. 4. and he is believed to have those excellencies which belong to Christ. *Bellarmine* saith, The Pope is the Universal Spouse of the Church: And *August. Beroius* saith, He is the foundation of Faith,

the Cauſe of Cauſes, and Lord of Lords. And *Baldus* ſaith, He is the living fountain of all righteouſneſs, *&c.*

2. They which believe as an Article of their Religion, that the Church, or the Head of it is above the Scripture (as hath been ſhewn before, and by my Brethren in their diſcourſes) they cannot be ſaved in that way; becauſe no Man can know certainly, where his Salvation is to be had, ſince it is (by their Tenets) in the Power of the Pope, to alter or add, as he ſhall think fit. The Pope ſet out by the two-Horned Beaſt, that ſpeaks like a Dragon, *Rev.* 13. 11. and is the ſame with the falſe Prophet, he takes to him the Authority of Chriſt, and more than Chriſt doth exerciſe, to make new Articles of Faith, to ſet up a new Worſhip in the Church, and to impoſe it upon all upon pain of death, baniſhment, excommunication, *Rev.* 13. 11, 12, 13, *&c.* This Beaſt which repreſents the Hierarchy of *Rome*, exerciſeth all the Power of the firſt Beaſt, *verſ.* 12. which was given him by the Dragon: *verſ.* 4. So that he is Satans Lieutenant and Vicar-General, eſpecially in taking ſuch a Power and Authority above the Scripture; and this muſt be believed as an Article of their Faith. Let ſuch conſider, how they can be ſaved in that Religion.

3. That Church which is caſt off of God and muſt not be meaſured, as refuſing to come under the Rule of the Word, is ſuch which none can be ſaved in; But ſuch is the Church of *Rome*, *Rev.* 11. 2, 3. There is that Church (*i. e.* Head and Members, and all the Offices, and Ordinances, Inſtitutions, Doctrine, Worſhip and Government) are all caſt out, as falſe, as having no Authority, or the Stamp of Chriſt upon them: Though they will plead an Intereſt in Chriſt, as *Mat.* 7. 22. yet Chriſt will utterly diſown them; though they will cry the Temple of the Lord, the Temple of the Lord, *&c.* yet they are caſt out, and given to the Gentiles to be troden under foot by the Gentiles. In regard that *Rome* having Apoſtatized from the Religion, and pure Worſhip of Chriſt, hath brought into the Church and publick Worſhip thereof, Pagan Idolatry under new names, of worſhipping of Angels, and Saints, or Dæmons, 1 *Tim.* 4. 1, 2. That Church which is thus caſt off of God, and his pure Worſhip is caſt off by them, as being like the Man of Sin, or being the Man of Sin, Head and Members; I do not ſee how Salvation is to be had in that Church as ſuch, thus diſallowed by God, as you have heard: Therefore it is that the Churches of Chriſt have caſt her off; and as Biſhop *White* in his anſwer to the Jeſuit, ſaith, we have caſt off the Pope, and his Teaching, for no other Cauſe, but that we are aſſured he is Antichriſt, and his Faith is Hereſie. If their whole Church and Worſhip be caſt out by God, as being under no Scripture-Rule; then the true Religion, true Faith, true Worſhip, are not to be looked for in them, and by conſequence, the Salvation of Souls is not to be expected from them.

5. *Infer.*

5. *Infer.* If the Pope or the Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchy of *Rome*, be that Antichriſtian ſtate which you have heard ſet forth, and there is a Myſtery of Iniquity in their Religion and Worſhip, and they are under ſuch black marks of reprobation, that do joyn with them in Communion, then it is fit that all Chriſtians ſhould be acquainted with the Myſtery of Iniquity in ſome meaſure, and ſhould ſtudy, as the grounds of the true Chriſtian Religion, ſo the ſeeming pretences, and falſe principles, and abominable practices of the Antichriſtian Religion.

1. We ſhould be acquainted with them, leſt we be deceived through ignorance, and overtaken with the devices of Satan; which *Paul* mentioneth, 2 *Cor.* 2. 11. and that we may be delivered from being plunged in the deeps of Satan, ſpoken of *Rev.* 2. 24. Are not the Nations deceived by them? *Rev.* 20. 3. Doth not the World worſhip the Dragon, and bow to the Image of the Beaſt, or receive his Mark, or have the name of the Beaſt, or the number of his Name? *Rev.* 13. 3, 4, 15, 16, 17. Do not the Kings of the earth commit Fornication with the Whore? And are not the Inhabiters of the earth Drunk with the Wine of her fornication? *Rev.* 17. 2. And all this becauſe they do not know the impoſtures of that Church in their Religion. Surely the Spirit of God would not have ſet out this Church under the notion of the Man of Sin, and thoſe ſeveral Beaſts in the *Revelations* and elſewhere; but that it was intended we ſhould know them to avoid them. How expreſs and punctual is *Paul*, in ſetting forth the Apoſtacy of the latter times? 1 *Tim.* 4. 1, 2, 3. He ſets out both the way of their deceits and the inſtruments. 1. He tells us of ſeducing Spirits. 2. The Doctrine of Devils. 3. They ſpeak lies in hypocriſy. 4. They are under a ſeared Conſcience, and care not what they ſay or do, to promote the Holy Catholick Church of *Rome*, as they call her.

2. We ſhould ſtudy their Myſteries, elſe (if we ſhould be called to ſuffer) we ſhall not be able to ſuffer on a clear, and comfortable account, as they *Rev.* 11. 7. and *chap.* 13. 7. They ſuffered becauſe they would not comply with the Man of Sin, in his Religion and Worſhip, nor conform to them, nor have Communion with them, as they did, *Rev.* 13. 3, 4, 14, 15. Thoſe in *verſ.* 7. ſuffered on that account.

3. We muſt know thoſe things, elſe we ſhall not be able to joyn in the Triumphant Song of *Moſes* and the Lamb, upon the pouring forth the Vials on this Antichriſtian ſtate. *They only ſtand on the Sea of Glaſs, having the Harps of God, and ſing the Song of Moſes, and which have gotten the victory over the Beaſt, and over his Image, and over his mark, and over the number of his Name*, *Rev.* 15. 2. they are perſons well ſeen in the deceits and impoſtures of that Church.

4. The Saints and Martyrs could not have born ſo noble a Teſtimony againſt the Man of Sin, in following the Lamb wherever he went, *Rev.* 14. 3, 4. And were and are at open defiance againſt them, declaring their deteſtation of their Religion and Worſhip; *verſ.* 8. 9, 10. un-

unless they did well know what they did. Indeed the Papists tell us we need not search into those things. The *Rhemists* in their *Annotations*, on *Acts* 1.7. say it is not needful to search into the times of Antichrist, *&c.* But Dr. *Fulk* answereth them, that it is necessary for us to know the coming of Antichrist as God hath revealed him. But the Ministers of Antichrist would have no enquiry made of him, lest they should be found in See of *Rome*, the Western *Babylon*; They would have us be ignorant of this point, and keep us in the dark, lest we should see their frauds. *Bellarmine de pontif. Rom. in præfat.* calls that point of the Pope, *summam rei Christianæ*, the very sum of the whole business of a Christian: And *Malvenda de Antichristo*, saith, he studied that one point twelve years. They count it a point most worthy to be studied, but they would keep the World in darkness and ignorance; lest if their Impostures should be detected, they would be abhorred, and their whole Religion being found to be a mere Delusion, it would be an Execration. And that will come to pass, by the discovery of further light of the Gospel, by which the prodigious enormities of that Church, and the *pudenda* of the Whore will be made manifest to all the World; that (I say) will come to pass which is prophesied of, *Rev.* 17. 16. *The ten horns---shall hate the whore, and make her desolate, and naked, and shall eat her flesh, and burn her with fire.* They shall Cart her as the mother of abominations, as a common strumpet throughout Christendom.

6. If the Papacy, the Hierarchy of *Rome*, of which the Pope is the Head, be such as hath been described by *Paul*, then there can be no peace with *Rome*, no Communion with *Rome:* How can there be Peace said *Jehu* to *Joram*, 2 *Kings* 9. 22. as long as the Whoredoms of *Jezebel* are so many? What peace can there be with that Church which is the Mother of Harlots, and abominations of the earth? *Rev.* 17. 5. What peace can there be with that Body Politick, which is the greatest enemy of Jesus Christ upon earth? What peace can there be between the followers of the Beast, *Rev.* 13. 3, 4, 15, 16, &c. and us adorers and admirers, and the followers of the Lamb? *Rev.* 14. 1, 2, 3, 4. They are flatly opposite the one to the other, the one having the mark of the Beast in their right hand and foreheads; the other the name of the Father, and of the Lamb (so some Copies have it) written in their foreheads, who did own and publish defiance to each other: So that we may say as it is, 2 *Cor.* 6. 16. *What agreement hath the Temple of God with Idols?* And *vers.* 14. 15. What Communion hath light with darkness, Christ and *Belial*, Christians and Antichristians, Truth and Falshood, the Church of *Rome* with the Protestant Churches together? Bishop *Hall* in his Book, *No Peace with Rome*, saith, Sooner may God create a new *Rome*, than reform the old. There was a reconciliation attempted by the Emperours, *Ferdinand*, and *Maximilian*; and *Cassander*,

Sander by their appointment drew a Project, in which he shewed his judgment, but without success. *Consultat. Cassandri.* It is said, that at a meeting at *Regenspurgh*, there was an agreement made touching Free-will, Original Sin, Justification, Faith, Merits, Dispensations, the Mass, *&c.* but this held not. *Acta Colloq. Ratisbon. An.* 1541. *Lindan. de querela pacis, præfat.*

The chief factours of the Church of *Rome*, are bitterly set against all reconciliation. See *Bellarm. de Grat. & lib. arbit.* He saith, that we embrace this opinion so much the more willingly, by how much it displeaseth our adversaries, and especially *Calvin.* And *Maldonat.* in *c. 6. Joh.* was so much abhorring from the Religion of the Protestants maintained by *Calvin*, that he saith, That though what he held was the same opinion with *Austin* and others of the Fathers, yet he rejected it because it was held by *Calvin.*

7. If these things be so concerning the Papacy as hath been said, then there is matter of admiration and gratitude to all such whom God hath delivered from compliance with or conformity to, or Communion with that Church, of which the Pope, which is the Man of Sin, the Son of Perdition, is the Head, *whose coming is after the working of Satan, &c.* v. 9. Whose Members are under his powerful Seduction, and the Judicial Tradition of God to believe a lie to their own *eternal damnation*, v. 10, 11, 12. Their condition must needs be most dangerous, who are Members of that Church; and therefore it is the greater mercy to be saved from that Seduction which thousands are under, whose Names are not written in the *Lambs book of life*, Rev. 13. 8. & 17. 8. They are under the black notes of Reprobation: To be saved from being of their Communion who worship the Beast, or his Image, and to be of that company of the Hundred forty-four thousand who are Virgins, and follow the Lamb where ever he goes, is worthy of eternal Praises. When we find such as are under the Seduction of the Man of Sin, the false Prophet, and the Whore, to be under the most fearful comminations from God, *Rev.* 14. 9, 10, 11. how they that drink of the Wrath of God, and in the presence of the Lord and his holy Angels for ever and ever; Is it not matter of very great admiration and praises, that we should be saved from their sin, and so delivered from their plagues.

8. If the Church of *Rome*, of which the Pope is the Head, be such a Body, so corrupt and abominable as hath been shewed, then it is dangerous and pernicious, to retain any relick of the Man of Sin, that false, erroneous, idolatrous Church, in Doctrine, Worship, or Government, which they have pretended to be according to the Word of God, but have wrested the Scriptures to their own destruction, as 2 *Pet.* 3. 16. It is dangerous to retain such customs and usages in the Church, whereby we may Symbolize with *Rome*; How fatal several things have been to the publick peace of the Church, which have been derived from Antichrist is too well known, from the divisions, contentions, and persecutions which have continued to this day. By these very means, the Papacy together with their Religion, have had a party,

and

and kept up an interest among the Protestant Churches, and also a favourable respect among many, who have had a secret affection for the Pope and his Religion. Such will not have it that the Pope is Antichrist; and they will needs have it that the Church of *Rome* is a true Church: And that she is the Mother-Church, and that we ought to return to our Mother, with such like. What was the cause that the Book of Articles of the Church of *Ireland* was called in, but because they declare the Pope to be Antichrist, and the Church of *Rome* to be no true Church, and that the Lords day was wholly to be sanctified. So *Montague* in his *Apello ad Cæsarem*, said, The Pope or Bishop of *Rome*, personally is not The Antichrist, nor yet the Bishops of *Rome* Successively. Dr. *Heylin* in his answer to *Burton*, maintaineth that the Pope is not Antichrist. *Christopher Dove*, and *Robert Shelford* were of the same mind.

9. Hence it follows that the Protestant Churches are unjustly charged with Schism in departing from *Rome*: the Papists charge us with Schism because we depart from them, and will not hold Communion with them; though there was the most just cause of this departure from them. 1. In regard they are heretical in their Doctrine, and obstinately persist in it, against all convictions to the contrary, for there have been attempts made to have healed *Babylon*, but she would not be healed, *Jer.* 51. 8, 9. therefore forsake her. *Him that is an Heretick reject, &c. Tit.* 3. 10. 2. When a Church becomes idolatrous in her Worship, as 2 *Cor.* 11. 16. then it is a duty to depart from them that depart from the Truth: upon *Jeroboam*'s defection and the peoples with him from the true Worship of God, there was a departure from them, by such as set their hearts to seek the Lord God of *Israel*. The Church of *Rome* became most corrupt and abominable in her Worship, else she had not been set out by the Whore riding the Beast, *Rev.* 17. 3. 3. When a Church becomes bloody, and tyrannical, and persecuting her Members to the death, then there is just cause of departing from them. Look on the Church of *Rome* set forth by the first and second Beast, *Rev.* 13. 1, 2,--11, *&c.* both which make up one Antichrist; see how cruel and bloody that Church is: So where it is set out by the Whore, *Rev.* 17. 5, 6. drunk with the blood of Saints, there is signified a just cause of departure from her. 4. When a Church groweth wholly corrupt and debauched in her Morals, very vicious and scandalous in the lives of Governours and Members, then depart; 2 *Tim.* 3. 1,--5, there 19 abominations, or thereabout, spoken of, of which many should be guilty, *from such turn away*; though they had a form of Godliness, since they did deny the power of it. I'le make no apology that I have put your patience so much to it, but this, That the Man of Sin, with whom I have had to do, is the most unruly Beast that ever was, and hath put the whole World into a disorder and confusion. And though I have exercised your patience while I have been Preaching on this Beast; yet I wish and pray that your patience may not be put to it by this Beast, as *Rev.* 13. 7. But if it should please God to let loose this Beast upon you, my prayer is, that it may be said of you, as it was of them, *vers.* 10. *Behold the Faith and Patience of the Saints.*

SERM.

SERMON V.

Of Christopher Fowler

The SCRIPTURE to be read by the Common People.

THE Controverſie before us is, Whether the Scriptures are to be read and heard, of, and by the Lay-people? and whether they are to be tranſlated into the Vulgar Tongues? the Papiſts deny, we affirm. My buſineſs will lye in three Propoſitions.

I. That the People are to hear and read the Scriptures.

II. That therefore the Scripture is: the Word of God was written for them, and to them.

III. Therefore it is to be tranſlated into Vulgar Tongues.

The firſt is an expreſs Precept; the ſecond is a reaſon to prove the firſt; the third is an Inference from both.

And ſeriouſly when I have been muſing upon this queſtion, I profeſs heartily I have been ſurprized with amazement, how ſuch a Controverſie ſhould ariſe amongſt Chriſtians (if Chriſtians). Might not a man as well diſpute whether a *Carpenter* ſhould have his *Line* and *Rule* to work by? or a *Soldier* wear his *Sword* in the midſt of Enemies? Shall I queſtion whether the *Air* be neceſſary for *Breath*, or *Bread* for *Life*, or the *Light* of the *Sun* for our Secular Affairs? Sure enough the Word of God is all this, a *Rule* moſt perfect, a *Sword* moſt victorious, *Air* moſt fragrant, *Food* moſt wholſome, and *Light* moſt clear; the Word of an Angel preciſely conſidered, is no ground for Faith, nor Rule for life, duty, and worſhip. The Word of God read and heard (ſaith our Church) is ſo great a good, *that the benefits ariſing therehence are inexpreſſible, unconceivable*; the Bible (ſaith that painful, pious, learned Biſhop *Hooper*) *Why*, (ſaith he) *God in Heaven, and the King in Earth hath not a greater friend than the Bible*, in his Epiſtle Dedicatory to King *Edward* the Sixth. But I ſhall ſay no more of theſe, nor of any Proteſtants, becauſe they are parties, and therefore their Teſtimony, though moſt true, is not proper. This Word is for the Soul, and is not the Soul more than Life; this light is to give the knowledg of the Glory of God

in the face of Jesus Christ; and is not this infinitely beyond all our natural and civil concerns? all these things here below, either within us or without us are short-lived and vexation, but this makes a Man wise, and that to Salvation, and that through the Knowledg of and Faith in our Lord Jesus. And after all this and much more that might be said concerning this treasury of all Wisdom and Knowledg, shall it be a question whether the People so highly concerned in these things, shall they hear or read the Scripture? this is to me is wonderful; But the question is put beyond all question as to our adversaries, 'tis defined, determined by the *Council* (as they call it) of *Trent* in the negative, that the Lay-people shall not read, or hear the Scriptures read, no, nor have a Bible in the Vulgar Tongue under great Penalties; nay, the Priest reads it not in their publick Worship. The words are these, *Si quis legere aut habere præsumpserit*; If any shall presume to read or have a Bible; what then? why, the penalty is this, *absolutionem peccatorum percipere non posset*; he may not, nay he cannot, be absolved from his sins, they exclude such a man from remission of his sins; it seems the reading of the Bible is a sin unpardonable. The people are taught to believe, That what the Pope binds on Earth is bound in Heaven; sure then (I judg this must be the sence of the Canon, (*viz.*) If a man that reads the Scripture, or hath a Bible in his House comes to confession and is absolved, that Absolution is invalid; he is not *subjectum capax*, he doth *ponere obicem*, there is a bar lies in his way to hinder his Absolution, and that bar is his reading or having the holy Bible. My reason is this, though he had a thousand Bibles, and did confess it to the Priest as his fault, he would absolve him, and the Absolution would stand good; so that to have a Bible and read it, puts a man into the state of Damnation, and no man can read the Scriptures but under the greatest penalty, *sc.* under the pain of Damnation. By this *Trent Conciliabulum*, Conventicle, you see, Wo be to the Bible, and all the friends thereof; *Bened. Furret* in his Preface to the Index, *Lib. Prob. & expurg.* tells us, that *Misericordiæ erga Dei librum nullus locus est*; There is no place of mercy left to the Book of God: Men fly from the Gospel (saith he) in the *Italian* or *Spanish* Tongue, *Peste citius*, faster than they would run from the plague of Pestilence.

But you will say the Councils prohibition of the Bible is with a limitation, *viz.* If you have a Bible without a license from the Bishop; they do not forbid licensed men the reading, and therefore wrong them not.

I answer, 'tis true they do speak to that purpose, I will not wrong them; but give me leave to do the truth and you right by telling you, that their pretence of a license is a very *flam*, a meer *gullery*, an abominable *cheat*, as I shall shew you in its place.

Further, that this Book may not spread abroad, the High-Priest and Elders in this Council straitly charge and command all Book-sellers and all Dealers in Books, that they sell not or any other way part with any one

one of these Books to any person upon the forfeiture of the price of the said Books, and to undergo all other punishment according to the *arbitrium*, will and pleasure of the Bishop. I confess this is drawn up very cunningly with much craft, as indeed all their Doctrines are expressed with artifice and subtilty. But if you read the Mandate of the Archbishop of *Toledo* by the Authority of *Paul the fifth*, there the punishment is this, *sc. For the first time he shall be punished*, suspensione Officii, *suspension from his Office*, *loss of his trade for two years*, *banishment twelve miles from the Town*, ubi Bibliopolium habuit, *for two years*, *and fined* 1200 *Ducats*; *Mille ducentorum Ducatorum mulcta puniendus*; this for the first fault. But for the second time, *si recidat*, then the *punishment to be doubled*, *and other punishments*, ex Inquisitoris arbitrio eroganda, *according to the will of the Inquisitor*; and all this, *Si quis habere aut emere vel vendere ausit*; if any dare *be so hardy as to have*, *or buy*, *or sell a Bible*. And those Traders that are not so skilful as to understand the Catalogue of Books prohibited, must either take a *man of skill into their Shop*, or *shut up their Shop-windows*; for whosoever shall offend in this case, though *per neglectum*, or *ignorantiam*, *a pœna*, *nulla ratione exemptum iri*; though *they offend through neglect or unskilfulness shall not be exempted from punishment upon any account whatsoever*. And *Paul* the fifth by his *Breve sub annulo Piscatoris* dated at *Rome*, 1612, forbids all persons, *Ne legant aut teneant*, that *they should not read or keep those Books under the punishment of the greater Excommunication*, and *other Censures*; but bring them by a certain day to be prefixed by the holy Inquisitor General, into the holy Office of the Inquisition; and accordingly the said Inquisitor in his *Pontificalibus* specifies in his Mandate this to be done within ninty days, all Books prohibited in the Index to be brought into the Office: Now amongst the Books in the Index, which are prohibited by Pontifical Authority, the *Bible* is the special *Book* forbidden. And to make all sure as much as may be by men and others, there are towards a hundred of *Latin* Versions of the Bible prohibited in this Catalogue; and to be yet more sure that the Bible of all Books may not escape, this Inquisitor General by the Popes Authority doth call in not only Books prohibited in the Index, but *Librum aut libros in Regulis Generalibus comprehensos*; *Book or Books comprehended in the General Rules*. Now the fourth General Rule (observe I pray) is made solely against the Bible in any vulgar Tongue, they are not to be endured; nay against any parts of it, as suppose some of *Davids* Psalms, or some of *Pauls* Epistles; nay, whether they be printed, or written, *sive excusa*, *sive manuscripta*; nay, all *Summaries* or *brief heads* of the *Bible*; nay, *quantumvis historica*, although it be a Compendium of the Historical parts of it, all is forbidden. And if any man of what calling or dignity soever, be he *Bishop* or *Patriarch*, be he *Marquess* or *Duke*, (where is the Tradesman or Farmer, or Gentleman now?) if any of these shall dare the contrary, they are *rebells to our Mandate*, immorigeri, *disobedient to holy Church*, and

ſhall be ſuſpect of Heretical pravity; and I promiſe you that is a fair way to the Inquiſition; *i.e.* the loſs of liberty, pains of the body, forfeiture of goods, and loſs of life *ut plurimum.*

Object. *But whatever you ſay, the Council doth permit reading the Bible in the Vulgar Tongue, provided you have a licenſe.*

Anſw. I told you before, this licenſe was a meer *blind*, a fallacy, a *flam*: But becauſe I am in hand with my Author, and to ſtay your ſtomachs till I come to handle this in its due place, for preſent I will only tell you this, (*viz.*) That Pope *Paul* the fifth in his Breve lately quoted doth recal all ſuch Licenſes. I will give you the ſum of it, it begins thus, *Ad futuram rei memoriam*; *Since as we underſtand the Licenſes of reading the Books of Hereticks, or Books ſuſpected of Hereſie*, or Books otherwiſe prohibited and condemned, (there comes in the Bible); *obtained under certain pretences*; do too much increaſe in the Kingdoms of *Spain*, (*in Regnis Hiſpaniarum*), and *underſtanding, that there is more danger to the unlearned than profit to the learned, by, and from the ſaid Licenſes*; we therefore *upon whom the burden of watching over the Lords flock is incumbent, being willing to provide a ſeaſonable remedy, and walking* in the ſteps of our Predeceſſors Popes of *Rome* (mark that for anon), *we do annul, caſſe, revoke*, Irritamus & viribus penitus evacuamus, *utterly make void all ſuch Licenſes, Faculties and Grants*, and by the tenour of theſe preſents we *do deciſe and declare the ſame to be caſſate*, void and null, *eaſque nemini ſuffragari poſſe*; granted *by whomſoever*, whether our *Predeceſſors, our Selves, our Penitentiary, Ordinaries, or Biſhops whomſoever*, and granted to *what perſons ſoever, whether Abbots, Patriarchs, Marqueſſes, Dukes*, or any other perſons *Eccleſiaſtick*, or *Mundane*, quacunque autoritate fulgeant, whether they have had their Licenſe by *Letters Apoſtolical*, in form of a Breve under the *Seal*, or any other peculiar way to make the Licenſe firm and laſting, we revoke and annul all to the utmoſt.

Non obſtantibus conſtitutionibus, Ordinationibus Apoſtolicis, any Conſtitutions and Ordinations Apoſtolical to the *contrary in any wiſe notwithſtanding, under the pains and cenſures of the Church to the higheſt*; & invocato ſi opus eſt brachio ſæculari, (*i.e.* under *the penalty of a Jayl*, a Dungeon, a Faggot); and we command *All Archbiſhops, &c.* to take care that theſe our Letters be *forthwith publiſhed in all Provinces, Cities, Dioceſſes, abſque alia requiſitione eis deſuper facienda*, *i.e.* without demurring, diſputing, demanding why or wherefore. Here is ſure work, not a creviſe, a chink left unſtopped. Do you not ſee what care here is taken to ſuppreſs all Licenſes, nay though under the Popes Seal? See what a roaring Bull here is, and what is your Licenſe now, I pray? a Fig-leaf. In the midſt of this Breve his Holineſs gives a *Mandamus* to the Inquiſitor-General, the Archbiſhop of *Toledo* to proſecute this Breve to the utmoſt, not to ſuffer any perſon though never ſo great to have or keep, or read, or buy, or ſell a Bible; which accordingly he did execute, as before.

For

For other Books I am not concerned, for baſtardly patches added to the Fathers, which are many, and caſtrations of them, which are groſs; if I could I may not meddle with that affair. I only take notice of the *Index Expurg.* how theſe Fathers of *Rome* blot out, and command to be blotted out the ſayings of the Ancient Fathers as they are placed in the *Indexes* made either by the Interpreters, or the Publiſhers of them: As for inſtance, in *Athanaſius* ſet forth *Græco-latin*; in the *Index* there was ſet down thus, *Scripturæ ſacræ etiam plebi & Magiſtratibus cognoſcendæ; Deleatur.* i.e. The Holy Scriptures are to be known even of the Common-people, and the Magiſtrates; blot that out ſay they: Again, *Scriptura ſacra ita clara eſt ut quiſque, &c.* The *Holy Scripture is ſo plain that any one may underſtand*; blot that out. Five more ſayings there are about the *ſufficiency* of the Scriptures, and that they only are to be heard; *Deleantur*, blot them all out; theſe Sentences will puzzle young Students, confirm the Hereticks: But indeed the true reaſon is they will diſcover our wickedneſs and hereſies. So they deal with St. *Auſtins* works, *Baſileæ ex Officina Froben. Purgatorium non inveniri in Scriptura*; Purgatory not to be found in the Scripture; *Deleatur*, let it be *expunged* ſay they; and good reaſon, for ſuch paſſages will make your Kitchin cold. And ſpecial order is given by theſe Fathers that care be taken *to blot out all ſuch paſſages*, *Ex quocunque alio indice:* ſpecially *4th. Edit. there named*, & ex aliis ſimilibus; and *Lib. 2. de Bapt. cont. Donat.* there is this ſhort paſſage, *Non eſt in Evangelio*; there is no ſuch thing in the Goſpel, Dele, *blot it out.* So they ſerve *Chryſoſtom*, *Baſileæ ex Offic. Frob.* 1558, *Sine Scriptura nihil aſſerendum*; *Scripturæ Divinæ omnibus volentibus pervie & faciles*; *Scripturarum lectio omnibus: Scripturas continere omnia, Scripturas legere, omnibus etiam*; with ſome others, as *Apoſtolorum Doctrina facilis & omnibus pervia:* i.e. *The Scriptures are plain to the willing, they are to be read of all, even* Artificers, the *Scriptures contain all things neceſſary*, and the like; away with theſe *ſays* Holy Mother Church, blot them out every one, and good reaſon, for open that door once, then farewell all. Hitherto we have had two Acts of the Pope and his Council, one to call in the Bibles condemned that were abroad; the other to prevent their going abroad for the future, but all too late: Alas this would not do, therefore they take two other courſes; the firſt was this, The holy Synod decreeth that no man dare (*audeat*) to *interpret or expound Scripture in another ſenſe, ſave that*, quam ſancta mater Eccleſia tenuit, which *holy Mother-Church hath holden, and doth hold; whoſe right it is* (cuius eſt) *to whom it belongs to judg of the interpretation of the holy Scripture:* although ſuch interpretations were never uttered before, they that ſhall oppoſe this let them be *declared by the Ordinaries*, and *puniſhed* according to the Statutes. So that if the Pope (for he is the Church, as you muſt know) ſhall affirm, *Joh. 21. 16. Paſce oves*, Peter *feed my Sheep*; if he ſhall ſay, that the meaning of that Text is this, that by theſe words our Lord Chriſt gave to *Peter* an Univerſal Headſhip over the Church, and in *ordine ad ſpiritu-*

ſpiritualia, a Soveraignty abſolute over all Kings to plant and pluck up, and that all this Power is given to the Pope as *Peters* Succeſſor; why then you are to believe it, you muſt not take any other ſenſe, though this be non-ſenſe and never heard of before, that is all one.

So the ſecond *Council of Nice*, quoted and approved by the Council of *Trent*, countenanced by the Legats and Lies of *Adrian* the firſt, proves Images to be worſhipped, thus, *No man lights a candles and puts it under a buſhel*, therefore the *holy Images are to be placed* upon the Altars; *O res inconſequens & riſu digna*, ſaid *Carolus Magnus*. But what is that, let it be never ſo ridiculous and worthy to be hiſſed at; you may not dare to take any other ſenſe, you may not quarrel at the Inference, though it be monſtrouſly irrational; if you do, they have two Swords, and with one they will cut you off from the *Church*, and with the other, *ſc.* the Secular, they will cut you off from the *Earth*; for the Church ſaith, That is the meaning of *Ecce duo gladii*, Behold *here are two Swords*; the one ſhall *unchriſtian* you, and the other ſhall *unman* you.

The ſecond courſe the Council hath taken to help themſelves, is this; They have added to the Holy Bible (deſpairing of any relief there) the *Apocrypha*, and make *Tobias* and *Judith*, and the two *Maccabees*, with the reſt of the Stories of *Bell* and the *Dragon*, a Rule for Faith and Life, and whoſoever ſhall not take them for the Word of God, Sacred and Canonical, they curſe him, let him be *Anathema*; they ſend a man to Hell, if he refuſe *Toby*. They have alſo ſtitched or patched to the Holy Bible their Traditions under the name of *Apoſtolical*, containing *matters appertaining to Faith and Life*; and theſe Traditions (which are in *ſcriniis pectoris Papæ*), under lock and key in the Popes breaſt, they command under the pain of *Anathema* to be received *pari Pietatis affectu & reverentia*, with an equal pious affection and reverence as we receive the Word of God. Oh horrible!

The firſt of theſe courſes, *viz.* to oblige men to underſtand Scriptures as the Church; *i.e.* the Pope expounds them, this is a reproach to the reaſon of Mankind; *Bubalum eum eſſe non hominem*, it degrades men into brutes. The ſecond goes higher, and is a reproach to the Soveraignty, Goodneſs, Wiſdom, Faithfulneſs of our Lord Jeſus. They do by this means horribly reproach the Apoſtles; for if the Adminiſtration of the Sacrament under one kind, and Invocation of Saints, Merit of works, Worſhip in an unknown Tongue, with others; if theſe be *Traditions* as their learned men ſay, and if their Traditions be Apoſtolical from the mouth of Chriſt, and dictates of the bleſſed Spirit as the Council ſaith; Oh then what an ugly and black reproach is here caſt upon the Apoſtles: nay, it is a moſt prodigious blaſphemy againſt the Lord Chriſt, and his holy Spirit, that the Apoſtles ſhould teach, and practiſe, and write one thing to the Churches, and after whiſper the clean contrary to ſome others who ſhould convey it by word of mouth to poſterity.

Any

Any man sees that these four points of Faith which they would prove by Tradition are directly contrary to what the Apostles preached and practised, and wrote to the Churches. But this is not my business, I only touch upon this.

But perhaps you will demand upon what reason the Council did thus decree? I *Answer*, they tell you, *sc. cum experimento manifestum sit*, 'tis manifest *by experience that the sufferance of the Bible in the vulgar tongue*, doth *more harm than good through mens rashness*; *Ergo we forbid it*: A doughty reason, no question of it! as if some Souldiers rashly abusing their weapons, therefore the General should command, and that upon grievous penalties, and that when they are faced by their deadly enemies, all the Army to be disarmed. Should a Protestant decree against Prayer, because Prayers of Papists are blasphemous? or against the use of the Lords Supper, because the Mass is Impious and Idolatrous? What decrees were these? Must Gods appointment be anulled, because of mens abuse? Why did they not decree that men should be prohibited the use of the light of the Sun by day, and Moon by night, because thieves and others abuse it? Doubtless such Decrees had not been so irrational and mischievous as this; for that light is for my body, for the face and converse with man, for my Secular affairs, and but for a time: but the light of the Scriptures (which they forbid with a curse) is for my Soul, for the face of Jesus, for Spiritual concerns, and for Eternity. The truth of the case is this, the experience of the Council was of that kind which *Demetrius* and the *Craftsmen* feared would be theirs; if *Paul* be suffered, down goes *Diana*, and our Market is spoiled. I will tell you as briefly and as fully as I can the story of this experience.

About the year 1516, the Friars are sent by *Leo 10th.* abroad with their Pardons to raise money for his Holiness, Indulgences for horrid Sins are sold at easie rates. Into *Germany* come the *Friars*, *Luther* (who had some years before quitted the study of the Law, and applied himself to the close and daily study of the Scriptures, and had been blessed with some taste of the Righteousness of Jesus Christ, unexpectedly began to stir against these Pardon-mongers; yet at first very mildly, not simply against the thing, but against the impudence and covetousness of the Friars: the Friars scornfully and publickly traduce *Luther*, he takes heart, and begins to dispute, write and preach against them; this spark thus blown suddenly becomes a great flame. The Pope begins to storm, and writes about this affair to Cardinal *Cajetan*; *Cajetan* disputes *Luther*, and quotes against him the Bull of *Clement* the sixth, which runs thus, *Whereas*, una guttula, *one drop of the Blood of Christ had been sufficient for Redemption*, *and streams of Blood came from his Body*; *all that Blood which was over and above*, Christ *had deposited as a precious treasure in the hand of* Peter, *Claviger* (the Key-keeper of Heaven) and to his Successor; *to be dispensed*, (*i.e.* to be sold) to Penitents; and so likewise the surplusage of the Merits of the Virgin *Mary*, and all the Saints, *Tanquam*

ite-

inexhausta condonandi materia, an *inexhaustible store-house of Pardons. Luther* retels the Bull by Scripture; *Frederick* of *Saxony* shews him favour, the University of *Wittemberg* defends him; *Frederick* the Duke of *Saxony* sends him *Cajetans* Letter; *Luther* intreats the Controversie may be decided in *Germany*; the Emperour summoned him upon safe conduct to appear at *Worms*; accordingly he appears, there in the Imperial Assembly, and after in the Lodgings of an Archbishop before some other Princes; he humbly but vehemently offers himself to be *tried by the Scriptures, or evident Reason*; he is banished *Germany*, and appeals to a General Council; the Pope fears a Council as the shadow of death. All this and much more was done in five years, it was day-light all abroad in several places by this time; the Gospel had dispelled the darkness of Popery without any great noise or bustle. The Council of *Trent* convened not till the year 1546, about thirty years after the Preaching of the Gospel began, and was carried on by men of renown, for learning, piety and pains; the Council prohibits the Bible *ob temeritatem*, for *the rashness of men*, but doth not tell us what men, nor in what. Our excellent and learned Translators in their *Epist. Dedicat.* to King *James* say, that they *expect to be maligned for their work by the Papists, because they desire to keep the people in ignorance and darkness.* Dr. *White* in his defence, *cap.* 51. saith, That *from mens rashness they dishonestly, nay most dishonestly, conclude the utter suppressing of the Scriptures, not that they care how they are used*, (for never any men used them so vilely as themselves, either in applying, reviling, or corrupting of them); but because *they are mad at the Bible which discovers their heresie.*

And if ever they get power again, 'tis probable (they may learn more wit by their experience, and *Rome*-Papal may serve the Book of God, as *Rome*-Pagan served the Oracles of the *Sybils* heretofore; namely, take it out of their Popish World, and chain it fast in the *Vatican*, there to be inspected only by a few Confidents, and to be expounded as the Pope pleaseth. *Origen* said of old that the *reading of the Scriptures was the torment of the Devil*; sure it torments some body else of later years, but in *Origens* time it was not so; the Bible burns the Devil, and the Pope burns the Bible.

Thus we have seen the Council biting sore, but not opening much; that is left to their Doctors, whose clamours have been loud and importunate, and their tongues set on fire from beneath against this holy Word from that day to this. They that do evil hate the light, the thief curseth the Candle, the Malefactor would dispatch his Judg; the design of these Doctors is to make the most sound and fully perfect Scripture to be as the people at the Pool of *Bethesda*, halt, blind, lame, withered. *Alb. Pigh.* a prime man (I promise you) gives this advice; They should (*declamitare*) *often declaim against the Scripture*, and that *Rhetoricis artificiis*, with *Rhetorical artifices* and *flourishes* complain of their *difficulty, darkness, shortness, lameness, imperfections, blemishes*; on t'other side

side they should strenuously contend for *the necessity, authority, certainty, perfection, clearness, of Traditions unwritten*; and then, *nullo negotio*, no doubt *they shall easily carry the day.* And what *Pighius* advised his fellows to do, he practised himself sufficiently. *Andradius* a great stickler in the Council, and a daring-man, takes the same course, and good reason; for he confesseth, That *many and weighty points too of their Religion would reel and stagger, if they were not supported by Traditions.* Orthod. Explic. *lib.*2.

Canus a considerable man Bishop of the *Canaries* tells his fellows, That there is *more force and strength to confute Heretick̃s in Traditions, than in the Scripture.* And after that he had wrested the Fathers, compared his adversaries to the Devil, quoting Scripture, alledged *Plato* and *Farguin* to justifie their practice, spit his venom into the face of the Bible, and urged a non-sensical argument, *viz.* Dabo legem, *I will put my Law in their hearts*; Ergo, there *are Traditions.* I say after this stuff he tells us the reason of it, *Quorsum hæc?* (saith he) *nempe omnem ferme disputationem; &c.* that *well-nigh all disputation with Heretick̃s is to be decided rather by Tradition than Scripture:* Lib.3. Com. loc.c.3. That is, in plain *English*, we must resolve our Faith and Practice in the things of God into the Popes breast, rather than into the word of Jesus Christ.

So likewise *Bristow* teaching his Scholar how to grapple with the Protestants, teacheth him thus; That he must *first get the proud Heretick̃s out of the weak and false castle of only Scripture*, (do you not observe his reverence? he calls the Scripture weak and false, *O durum & impium!*) *and bring him into the plain field of Traditions*, and then the *cowards will run*; *i.e.* set the Pope in the Throne, and Christ at his Foot-stool, and then no doubt of the victory. For you must know the Pope hath the plenitude of all Power, to mint and stamp Traditions, to allow Miracles, and to expound Councils and Fathers as he pleaseth, and then all is our own. *Bristow ult. Mot.*

I am weary of this, it were endless to repeat their Blasphemies in advancing the Papacy, and abusing Scripture. I will name but one Doctor more, when I have told you a Story out of a good Author. About the year 1523, seven years after *Luther* began to preach, they were so mad against the Scriptures, and so vexed at the light, *that they burned two* Austin *Friars at* Brussels, *only for this, that they preferred the Scriptures above the Popes Decrees.* There appears nothing else in the History, *Cum in eo persisterent, damnati sunt capitis & exusti*; Sleidan. Commen. lib.4. Send men out of the World in fiery flames, because they will prefer Christ the Lord above the Pope! this is somewhat hard.

The Doctor (I mean) is *Coster* the Jesuit, he in his *Enchir. cap.*1. divides Gods Word into three Parts: The first Part is that *which he wrote himself in the two Tables.* The second Part *that which he commanded to be wrote by others; the Old and New Testament.* The third Part, *that which he neither wrote himself, nor rehearsed to others, but left it to them to do*

themſelves, as Traditions, the *Popes Decrees*, and *the Decrees of Councils.* And he makes this Application of his Diſtinction, that many *things of Faith are wanting in the two former*, (very good, it ſeems God by himſelf, and by his Prophets and Apoſtles gives out his mind defectively); *neither would Chriſt have his Church depend upon them*; (Oh horrible daringneſs)! The latter (ſaith he) *viz.* the *Traditions and Popes Decrees are the beſt Scripture*, the *Judg of Controverſies*, *the Expoſitor of the Bible, and that whereupon we muſt wholly depend.* That is, blot out the Sun, and ſet up a ſtinking Farthing-candle, this is the deſign. However you may obſerve in a few words a great deal of blaſphemy, and ſome honeſty: the Blaſphemy lies in theſe particulars. 1. That God hath revealed his Will ſhort and ſcanting; a horrid reproach to the glory of his Wiſdom and Mercy! 2. That the Lord Chriſt would not have us truſt to his Word; a moſt vile reproach to his Care and Faithfulneſs over his own Houſe! 3. That muſty, duſty Traditions, and the Popes Decrees are the Word of God. 4. That the Decrees of men, of whom ſome have been *Negromancers*, *Converſers with the Devil*, *Poyſoners*, *Murtherers*, *Adulterers*, nay *Traytors*, *Blood-ſuppers*, *Ignorant*, are the Rule of Faith: The Honeſty is in this, that he joyns hand in hand, together Traditions and Popes Decrees, and well they may, for they are brethren, and have one and the ſame Parent. 2. In that he confeſſeth that Traditions were not rehearſed or delivered from God by word of mouth; and therefore the Council of *Trent* put a ſad and miſerable blind and cheat upon Princes and People, while they ſay that Traditions were either ſpoken by Chriſt, or dictated by the Holy Ghoſt.

Leſt any man ſhould ſay that theſe Doctors were private men, which is their common and laſt ſhift, I will ſhut up all with their *new Creed.* Know then, that *Paul* the 4*th.* ſet forth a Creed of his own, conſiſting of Twelve Articles, added to the Twelve of the Creed, called the Apoſtles; out of which I ſhall take only three, proper to my buſineſs. The title of it is, *The publick profeſſion of the Orthodox faith to be uniformly obſerved and profeſſed.* The firſt Article is, The *Apoſtolick and Eccleſiaſtical Traditions, and other Obſervances and Conſtitutions of* that Church do *I firmly admit and embrace.*

2. Art. *Alſo the Sacred Scriptures do I admit according to that ſenſe which our Mother the Church hath holden, and doth hold*, whoſe right it is to judg of *the true ſence and interpretation of the Scriptures.*

3. Art. *I do vow and ſwear true obedience to the Biſhop of* Rome, *and all other things likewiſe do I undoubtingly receive and confeſs, which are delivered, defined and declared by the ſacred Canons and General Councils*, eſpecially the *holy Council of Trent*; and withal I *condemn, reject and accurſe all things that are contrary hereunto*; and *all Hereſies whatſoever condemned, rejected, and accurſed by the Church.* And this true Catholick Faith *I will maintain inviolate to the laſt gaſp*; *and I will take care of thoſe which ſhall be under me, or ſuch as I ſhall have charge over in my calling, to be holden, taught*

taught or preached to the uttermoſt of my power; this I promiſe, vow and ſwear; So God be help me, and his holy Goſpel.

Thus the Bow is bent, and the Arrow upon the ſtring to ſhoot through the heart of the Scripture, the foundations of the Prophets and Apoſtles muſt be caſt down, or elſe Babel will fall; there is the *origine* of theſe and ſuch like out-ragious reproaches upon the Oracles of the bleſſed God: Paſs over to the Iſles of *Chittim*, go to *Kedar*; Did ever any Nation do this to their Oracles? Did the Pagans ever do ſuch indignities to the dictates of their *Druides?* or their *Brachmans?* or the *Turks* to their *Alchoran?*

This Controverſie then, whether the People of God ſhould read and hear the Word of God, (which would make a man wonder that ever ſuch a queſtion ſhould be moved, the duty being ſo ſolemnly enjoyned, the practice of it ſo neceſſary, the fruit of it ſo profitable, which made *David* wiſer than his *Enemies*, than his *Teachers*, than the *Aged*, better to him than *all treaſures*, *ſweeter* than the *honey-comb.*) I ſay this Controverſie ſhall through Gods aſſiſtance diſcuſs and deliver you my thoughts upon it from the 1 *Theſſ.* 5. 27. that is my Text.

---

1 Theſ. 5. 27. *I charge you by the Lord that this Epiſtle be read to all the holy Brethren.*

THis Text is a Conſtitution *Scriptural*, one of the true Canons of the Apoſtles, directly oppoſite to the Conſtitutions of the Pope, and the Canons of the Council of *Trent*, as we ſhall ſee by and by. It may be reſolved into theſe parts;

1. An Injunction to a Duty, that is Reading, *that it be read.*

2. The ſubject or matter to be read, that is, *this Epiſtle.* And by the ſame reaſon all the reſt, for the wit of all the Jeſuits in the World cannot frame an Objection againſt the Reading of any, which may not be as well made againſt the reading of this one.

3. The Object or Parties to whom, the *holy Brethren*, i.e. the People.

4. The Extent, *to all*, all the holy Brethren.

5. The Solemnity of this Injunction, *I charge you*, not I beſeech, or intreat, or I exhort, (as ſometimes he doth), but *I charge*; and that not ſimply a bare charge, but the higheſt that can be, and the only time that ever *Paul* did give this which is ſo high, that none can be higher. He doth indeed charge *Timothy* ſolemnly, 1 *Tim.* 6. 13. but there it is, before ἐνώπιον τῦ θεῦ, *in the preſence of God*; but in my Text it is τὸν κύριον, *i.e.* τῦ τὸν κύριον, *by the Lord*; there it is παραγγέλλω, *præcipio*, *I charge*, *I command*; but here it is, ὁρκίζω, *I charge*, *I adjure*; ὁρκίζω, is *juramento obſtringo*; it hath the force of an Oath, and that under the

curſe, *I adjure thee*, (ſaith the High Prieſt) to our Lord Chriſt, *Mat.* 26. 63. ἐξορκίζω σε, *I adjure thee by the living God tell us*; implying an Execration in caſe of ſpeaking falſly. The Apoſtle *Paul* doth not deal with them in this place, *obſecrando*, as the *Latins* uſed to do, *per Deos Deaſque omnes*, as ſome think; (yet even in that ſenſe the words had been very vehement, and in caſe of failure of not reading would import vengeance on them for it), but here he deals *execrando*, his charge hath the form of an Oath, obliging under pain of the curſe, and ſo Dr. *Hammond* renders it: הַאֲלִיתִי *in Hiphil*, is literally and critically to *make ſwear*, to *adjure*; and is expreſſed by *Pauls*, ὁρκίζω, 1 *Theſſ.* 5. 27. I bind you under the curſe of God that this Epiſtle be read. The Law concerning this we have *Numb.* 5. 21. where we have not ſimply an Execration, but there we have the Oath of Execration: Thus he upon *Mat.* 26. *note* 1.

The Text thus explained (methinks) among ſober men ſhould quickly decide the Controverſie; For whether we ſhould obey the Lord Chriſt, or the Council of *Trent*? Whether we ſhould believe *Paul* the Apoſtle ſpeaking by the Holy Ghoſt, or *Paul* the Pope ſpeaking by a pack of Paraſites, judg ye: Which curſe of the two ſhould we dread, this of God in the Text, or that of Man at *Trent*? Surely there is no difficulty to determine this point.

The words thus opened will to our buſineſs afford us three Obſervables; 1. The ſtate of the *ſeries* of Popes or Antichriſt. 2. His Character. 3. His Confutation.

1. *His ſtate is a ſtate accurſed*; I offer my proof thus. They that do not read the Scriptures to the People in the vulgar Tongue, according to the duty of their Office, nor ſuffer the people to read themſelves; nay, that do prohibit them to have a Bible, and that by a ſevere Law under a grievous penalty; theſe for ſo doing are bound under the curſe of God; But Antichriſt doth all this: Therefore the ſtate of Antichriſt is a curſed ſtate. The Propoſition or Major is the Text, the Truth of God; the Aſſumption is notorious, the Practice of *Rome* or Antichriſt: The Concluſion is regular and natural.

Add to this the wo our Lord Jeſus denounceth againſt the Scribes and Phariſees, *Mat.* 23. 13. becauſe they did *ſhut up the Kingdom of Heaven, took away the key of knowledg.* Luk. 11. 52. *They neither went in themſelves, nor ſuffered thoſe that were entring to go in*; yet theſe never ſuppreſſed the Bible in their own Tongue, much leſs prohibited the reading of it by the People; neither did the Scribes omit the reading of it to the People. The Argument holds from the leſs to the greater; in both theſe the Scribes were Saints in compariſon to the Popiſh Doctors, and the non-expounding by far a leſs ſin than the prohibition, and that by a Law under grievous penalty, nay death it ſelf, as it will appear anon.

2. Here we have the marks of Antichriſt, *Dan.* 7. 24. (for it cannot with

with truth and ſenſe be underſtood of any other), ſaith of him, *He ſhall think to change times and laws, ſc.* of the *moſt High*. *Paul* giveth this mark of him, He ſhall not only exalt himſelf above all Auguſtneſs, (Σέβασμα σέβας&, *Auguſtus* ſc. *Cæſar*, Act. 25. 21.) not only above the Emperour and Princes, but 2 *Theſ.* 2. 4. *ſhews himſelf as God*, ſc. *in changing Laws Divine*, and making new Laws, new Creeds to bind the Conſcience; this mark is viſible in many particulars. But to my buſineſs, thus; The Lord Chriſt *commands* the people to ſearch the *Scripture*; the Pope *commands* no, no ſuch matter. *Chriſt* commands them to ſearch *Moſes* and the Prophets, the *Old* Teſtament; the *Pope* forbids them to ſearch either *Old*, or *New*. Chriſt ſaith, *In them you think to have eternal life*; the Pope ſaith the contrary, There is more *danger* of eternal death. Chriſt gives this reaſon, *they teſtifie of me*; the Pope ſaith, No, they are very *dark* and *obſcure*, very ſhort and *defective*, therefore no competent witneſs. Chriſt ſaith, *Let my word dwell in you richly*; the Pope ſaith, No, not dwell, no not in your Houſes. Chriſt ſaith, *teaching and admoniſhing one another*; the Pope ſaith, *Brabling* and *perverting* one another. Chriſt ſaith, *Whatever you do in word or deed, do it according to my word*; the Pope ſaith, Do my word, obſerve *our Decrees, or elſe I will burn you*. Chriſt commands in my Text that this Epiſtle *be read*; the Pope commands the contrary, No *reading*. Chriſt ſaith, *To all the Brethren*; the Pope ſaith, No, not to any *Lord*, or *Duke*, or *Prince*; (*Franciſcus Encænas* as learned a man as *Spain* afforded, was impriſoned fifteen Months, expecting death every day, but marvelouſly delivered; only for preſenting the New Teſtament in *Spaniſh* to the Emperour *Charles* the Fifth). Chriſt ſaith, *I charge* you to read; the Pope ſaith, I *charge you*, you do not read. Chriſt ſaith, I *charge you under my curſe*; the Pope ſaith, I *charge you not to do it*, under the *curſe* of the *Church*. Chriſt ſaith, I charge you under the *pain of Hell-fire*; the Pope ſaith, I charge you do not under the pain of Hell, and the Stake in *Smithfield* too.

Thus you ſee his mark, and 'tis the ſame in many other Particulars; as for inſtance, Chriſt *commands* in the Supper, *Drink ye all of this*; the Pope prohibits it, *Not a man of you ſhall drink a drop*; but that is excentrical, now it is the buſineſs of another.

3. Here we have the *Confutation* of the Popiſh Doctrine and Practice; and this ariſeth out of the Premiſes thus: If the Lord Chriſt frequently commands the reading of the Scriptures by the People, and ſolemnly charged the reading of them to the People, then Popiſh Doctrine and Practice is falſe, and wicked: But Chriſt doth do ſo; Therefore their Doctrine is falſe, and their Practice wicked. On the other ſide; If the Premiſes be true that Chriſt hath commanded and charged this, then the Doctrine and Practice of the Proteſtants is holy, juſt and good; But Chriſt hath ſo done: Therefore their Practice is good. Obſerve from hence, That Popery is not only an *addition* to the Doctrine of Chriſt (as

ſome

ſome pretend) but an *Oppoſition*, a flat *Oppoſition* to it; and where it is an *addition*, as in the great buſineſs of Juſtification by the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt alone, there the *addition* is a *deſtruction*; 'tis ſuch an addition as *Agrippina* made to the Meat of *Claudius Cæſar*, ſuch an addition as deſtroys Religion, and poyſons the Soul. So the Invocating of God, *Meritis & Interceſſione*, by the Merits and Interceſſion of Saints, and the formal Invocation of Saints and Angels, requeſting their *opem & auxilium*, (very large words, and the very words of the Council), entreating *their help and aſſiſtance*; is not a bare addition, but horrid Blaſphemy and palpable Idolatry: For which things ſake our famous *Engliſh* Divines have held the Church of *Rome* to be no more a true Church, than a *Murdereſs* and a *Whore* can be a *true Subject*, and a *true Wife*; a Metaphyſical verity is an idle whimſey in Moral concerns. And they have held alſo, That a man living and dying a full Papiſt could not be ſaved; every one, ſaith he, may be ſaved from Popery, that is not the buſineſs, but whether he may be ſaved in it? they ſay, No.

In oppoſition to the Popiſh Doctrine this day, I have three things (as I have told you) to aſſert. 1. That the Scriptures are to be read by, and to the People of Chriſt. 2. That therefore the Scripture is Scripture, the Word of God was therefore written. 3. That it is to be tranſlated into the Mother-tongue. The firſt is a plain Duty and conſtant Practice. The 2*d*. is a Reaſon to prove it. The laſt is a manifeſt Inference from them both; For if the Word of God were therefore written that it might be read to and by the People, then it follows of courſe, that it is lawful, honourable, neceſſary to be tranſlated; for if the Shell be not broken, how can we come to the Kernel? if the Trumpet give an uncertain ſound who ſhall prepare himſelf to the Battel? if the Stone be not removed from the Wells mouth, how ſhall the Maidens draw Water?

1. Of the firſt, *Col.* 4. 16. When this *Epiſtle is read amongſt you, cauſe it to be read in the Church of the* Laodiceans; and that *ye read alſo the Epiſtle of* Laodicea, *Epheſ.* 3. 4. Whereby *when you read* ye *may underſtand my knowledg in the Myſtery of Chriſt*. This Epiſtle (it is very probable) was written to all the Churches of *Aſia*, as that to *Corinth* was to all the Churches of *Achaia*, and it is likely the Epiſtle to the *Laodiceans* (being one of theſe Churches) was the ſame with this to *Epheſus*: If any would ſee more of it, he may conſult Dr. *Ushers* Annals, *ad annum Chriſti* 64. or Dr. *Hammond* upon *Col.* 4. *n. a.* All that we get by it, is no more than what we had reaſon to believe before for the ſubſtance: *ſc.* That this Epiſtle was communicated to all the Churches of *Aſia*; only it ſeems very probable that this Epiſtle was inſcribed to the ſeveral Churches by name, one by one. Now theſe two Texts throw *Dagon* upon the threſhold: For obſerve 1. the Apoſtle takes it for granted, that they would read it; nay, he commands them to take care that others may read, and that they read his Epiſtle written to others. 2. He takes

takes them for men of understanding, he doth not look on them as *brutes*. 3. Not only understanding more obvious Truths, but even the Mystery of Christ; he doth not tell them, these are *hard*, *obscure*, they are not for the vulgar, the *rabble*, the *lay people*, in whom there is not *mens*, *consilium*, or *ratio*, but a meer *Bellua multorum capitum*, a *many-headed*, and a *mad-headed Beast*. 4. He doth yield or submit his own understanding of that Mystery to the discerning of these *Ephesians*. The third Text shall be that of *James* in the Council at *Jerusalem*, Act. 15. 21. *For Moses of old hath them that preach him, being read in the Synagogue every Sabbath-day:* This was the old practise from ancient times, *and still is*, saith *James*. Again *Act.* 13. 15. *After the reading of the Law and the Prophets, the Ruler sent to Paul*; it being the custom of the *Jewish* Doctors after reading to expound some Scripture for the instruction of the People; so the Ruler sent to *Paul* and *Barnabas*, and *Paul* preached; one would think this might suffice.

The Testimony of such a Council, the universal, ancient practise of the *Jews* in their Worship, practised by our Lord Jesus, *Luk.* 4.16. He went into the Synagogue *as his custome was on the Sabbath-day, and stood up for to read.* Again, the Lord Jesus often in his answers to their questions appeals to their own reading; very often this is his practise; for instance, in the case of Divorce, *Mat.* 19.3,4. *Have ye not read that he which made them in the beginning, made them male and female?* And again, for this cause *a man shall forsake father and mother, and they twain shall be one flesh.* So when the Children cried, *Hosanna*, *Have ye not read*, saith he, *out of the mouths of babes, &c.* Mat. 21.16. and *v.*42. *Did ye never read in the Scriptures, the stone which the builders refused?* and have ye not read in the Scripture so much as this, *What David did when he was hungry*, Luk. 6. 3. how *he eat the shew-bread, and they that were with him?* And *have ye not read in the Law how the Priest prophane the Temple, and are blameless?* Mat. 12. 5. Very frequently he quotes the Scripture, but mentions not the Prophet nor the Section, they were so well acquainted by reading, and hearing it read, they knew very well the Text. The Sadducees put a case out of the Scripture, *Moses saith if a man die, &c.* he tells them, *They err, not knowing the Scripture*; answers their argument out of the Scripture, appeals to their own reading, *Have ye not read* (saith he) *that which was spoken unto you by God, I am the God of Abraham*, &c. *Mat.* 22.31, 32. Pray observe God spake that to *Moses* sixteen hundred years before they were born; and Christ saith, God spoke it to them, then it did concern them to know it; then they ought to use the means, then they ought to read, *Have ye not read what God spake to you?* So when he speaks of the abomination standing in the holy place spoken of by *Daniel* the Prophet; he doth not beat them off and tell them it is dark and difficult, no, but directly the contrary, *Let him that readeth, understand*, saith he, *Mat.* 24. 15. And so in the *Revelation* (and sure *Daniels* Prophecy, and *Johns* Revelation are the difficul-

test:

teſt pieces in the holy Bible), he is ſo far from affrighting his People from reading of it as a thing unfit or dangerous, that he begins the Revelation with a Bleſſing to the Reader, *Bleſſed is he that readeth*, Rev. 1. 3. Yea, but every one cannot read; why then, *Bleſſed are they that hear*; but why read and hear? why, *that they may underſtand and keep the ſayings of this Book*: the ſealed Book with ſeven Seals is opened, and in the little Book the time determined is expreſſed by days, months, and years, and in every of theſe things there is an agreement to a tittle, we know not indeed where to commence; and I think it is *fælix neſcientia*, a profitable neſcience; but ſure the Book is profitable.

I wonder with what face the *Jeſuits* of *Rhemes* in their Preface on their Annotations, could ſcurrilouſly ſcoff at the Hereticks for reading the Revelation; did they ſet themſelves on purpoſe againſt the Teſtimony of Jeſus Chriſt? *They* (the Proteſtants) *read, and to ſee out of pride of heart, and we know what ſpirit they vaunt*; the *Cantica canticorum*, the *Romans* and the *Apocalyps*. Oh ye Jeſuits what makes you to rage and revile, what harm theſe Books do to you! I gueſs this is the reaſon, the *Canticles* in a Heavenly way treats of the near Union of the Church to Jeſus Chriſt, and her daily Communion with him by Faith, Love, Bleſſing, Prayer, Meditation and Obedience to him. Doth this offend you? But why I wonder do you mention the *Romans*, as if it were ſo great a fault for the People of God to read the *Romans*; avaunt impudence joyned with ſpight and malice! had you no more diſcretion but to tell the World in print, That, that Epiſtle did torment you? The truth is, that Epiſtle heweth Popery all to pieces; their mincing Original ſin, their curſed diſtinction of ſins into *Venial* and *Mortal*, (which one diſtinction ruins more Souls than any one in the World, and brings them in more gain than any other), their Juſtification by Works, their Doctrine of Apoſtacy, Election conditional, with the reſt are all confuted and confounded by that Epiſtle.

Beſides in *Pauls* numerous Salutations of the Saints at *Rome* in the 16. *chap.* he never mentions *Peter*, not any-where elſe in the Epiſtle, never mentions his care over them, or pains amongſt them, nor their reſpect or duty to him; a ſhrewd ſuſpicion, and it is no way fit the People ſhould know ſo much.

For the *Revelation* every one knows the reaſon why they cannot abide that Book to be known and read; for there is deſcribed the great Whore, intoxicating Princes, and the Inhabitants of the Earth with the Wine of her Fornications; the City is ſo plainly deſcribed to be *Rome*, that every Reader preſently underſtands it of the Papacy. And well they may, for the attempts of learned men to apply the *Revelation* to *Rome*-Pagan are lighter than vanity; and the attempts of the Jeſuits to accommodate it to an *Antichriſt* at *Rome*, three years and a half before the end of the World, is moſt *fabulous* and ridiculous; and yet a horrible cheat in *France*, *Spain*, and *Italy*, and other places, where the

the Papists dwell, that Chymerical Antichrist goes for currant.

But to proceed, there are Scriptures yet behind, and they are principal ones, none beyond them; perhaps you think what needs you prove it any more, it is as clear as the Sun? I answer, I have told you my thoughts have been the same; I have wondred how our Divines could be so copious, so laborious, so exact in a point so plain, till I considered that it is one of the main points of greatest moment; let this be for a wonder to us, that the Popes, the Councils, Cardinals, Doctors, men of parts, convenienced with all helps of Libraries, Arts, Languages, should either be so blind, or blinded as not to see it, or else so daring as to deny it, or else so desperate, (this is the case) as tooth and nail, by all means, flattery, fallacy, force, wrestings, perverting Scriptures, Fathers, Councils, to oppose it, to disparage, to blaspheme it, and all to rob the People of God of it, and to make merchandise of their Souls; for that is the meaning of that Text, *Rev.* 18. 13.

The first is that of Christ, *Joh.* 5. 39. *Search the Scriptures*; the Context tells you that Jesus had healed the Cripple that lay at the Pool, the *Jews* cavil at him for carrying his bed, *v.* 10. he defends himself by the Command of him that cured him, *v.* 11. he comes and tells them, *sc.* the *Jews*, that it was Jesus which made him whole, *v.* 15. Upon this the *Jews* sought to kill Jesus, *v.* 16. Upon this Jesus began to preach to them, *v.* 18. to the last *v.* and in this 39. *v.* he commands and exhorts them to search the Scriptures, as if he had said, you will not believe me, though you see my works, and I would not have you believe the Scribes to whom you give too much credence, between us both believe your own eyes, search the Scriptures. *Moses* and the Prophets wrote of me. There is the first.

The second is that of the *Bereans*, That *they searched the Scriptures daily whether these things were so*; and they are highly commended for it by the blessed Spirit, *they were more noble*; (Ah the poor *Rhemists*), yet they had their best wits, and did their best endeavours, and many a year they were a contriving their Annotations), how are they confounded and puzzled here! something they would seem to say, but 'tis worse than nothing, because it is nothing to the purpose; and indeed what can be said; a man had need to have a special faculty in railing and casting mists before so clear a light; for this Text avows three things which are the very state of the Controversie. 1. That the Scriptures were in the *vulgar* Tongue. 2. That as they were in their own Tongue, so the *Laity* had them in their own hands. 3. That they did read them, and heard them read; there was nothing of any Imperial or Pontifical Power to hinder them, no Monks nor Friars to discourage them and impeach them too. The question being thus cleared, add to this, *ex abundanti*, the practice of these *Bereans* which was *searching*, and that daily, *these Scriptures*, for which they are commended, and that by God himself for so searching; and any sober man would think it

impoſſible for any to gain-ſay it; leſt the people whoſe Souls are precious and immortal in other Countrys enjoy the ſame priviledges as the *Beræans* had, and then if they do not read and hear, and ſearch, their deſtruction will lie at their own door; but if they be debarred and die in their ſins through ignorance, if they periſh for want of knowledg, their blood will be required elſewhere. Wo be to *the Pariſh-Prieſts*, wo be *to the Biſhops*, wo to the *Prelates*, ſaid one of their own.

The third and laſt is that of *Moſes* in the year of releaſe, *Deut.* 3. 11, 12, 13. *When all Iſrael is gathered together, men, women, children, ſervants, all the ſtrangers within the gates, thou ſhalt read this Law before them in their hearing.* I ſay nothing of the King, who is commanded to have a *Copy of the Law, and to read therein all the days of his life*, Deut. 17. 19. Nor of *Joſhua* the Captain-General, *the Law, the Book of the Law ſhall not depart out of thy mouth, but thou ſhalt meditate therein day and night*, Joſh. 1. 8. Nor the *Chamberlain* of the Queen who was *reading in his Chariot the Book of Iſaiah*, Act. 8. Nor *Peters* exhorting the Twelve Tribes to take heed to walk according to the Scriptures as a *light*, and a more ſure word of Propheſie, than any particular voice from Heaven, though that was moſt ſure alſo, 2 *Pet.* 1. 19. Nor *Pauls* bidding Believers *to try all things*, 1 Theſ. 5. 19. which trial muſt be by a Rule, which is the Word of Chriſt, with which Rule they muſt be well acquainted, or elſe they will be but ſorry triers. Theſe and many others I muſt paſs over, and deſire you to conſider what you heard. The adverſaries to this truth know all this full well, but what care they for *Moſes?* tell them that *Moſes* took the blood and ſprinkled the Altar, and *read the Book of the Covenant in the Audience of the People*, Exod. 24. 6, 7. What care they for *Moſes* precept or practice, or threatning? for why, they aſſert that *Papa poteſt diſpenſare contra Moſen*; if you argue from the Apoſtles, why then, *Papa poteſt diſpenſare contra Paulum.* To be ſhort, a learned *Frenchman* (no *Hugenot*) tells us, Dr. *Gloſſatour* upon the Canon-Law avowed by the *Rota* in *Rome*, affirms that the *Pope may diſpenſe againſt the Apoſtle, againſt the Old Teſtament, againſt the four Evangeliſts, againſt the Law of God*; Review of the Counc. *Trent*, lib. 5. cap. 3. To what purpoſe ſhould I ſtuff my Diſcourſe with Quotations, *Papa poteſt*, the Pope can diſpenſe, when we ſee he doth do it, and it is ſo determined by the Council with an *Anathema* to the gain-ſayer in the buſineſs of Marriage, *Can.* 3. *de Matrimonio, Si quis dixerit Eccleſiam non poſſe diſpenſare in nonnullis, &c.* If *any ſhall affirm the Church cannot diſpenſe in ſome things forbidden about Marriage in Leviticus*, let him be accurſed. If a man reply that theſe Marriages were abominable among the Heathen before *Moſes* was born, and for theſe ſins God caſt them out, and therefore they were ſins againſt the light of Nature; and by that reaſon the Pope cannot diſpenſe: *piſh*, the Anſwer is eaſie, *Papa poteſt diſpenſare contra Rationem*, the Pope can diſpenſe againſt Reaſon. If you reply that *Paul* did deliver to Satan the *Corinthian*, for one of theſe Marriages prohibited;

ted; the Answer is, *Paulus non potuit*, Paul *could not dispense*, but *Peter could.* Thus you see there is no defending of Popery in this and other Controversies, but by setting the Pope above God. The damned Angels would be as God; but here is one that acts Superiority over Christ, *who is God over all, blessed for ever*, Rom. 9. 5.

The second Point to be discussed is this; That the *Bible had never been but for the use of the people of God*; God therefore commanded the Doctrines, Precepts, Promises, Providences, Prophesies to be *written* for them; and therefore they are to read it, and to hear it read; nay more as they were written for the People; so by Gods appointment they were written to the People: therefore the People are not to be debarred from the reading, and hearing of them. A man that denies these Arguments must be (to refresh my self with *J. G*'s language), the *first-born of impudence and non-sensicality.* The two Antecedents I shall prove by parts; the first is proved by *Rom.* 15. 4: Whatsoever *things were written before time were written for our learning*; and the best learning too in the World, that we all through *patience and comfort of the Scriptures* might *have hope*; for our learning, mine and yours, ye Saints at *Rome*, Tent-makers, Artificers, Men, Women, Old, Young; *for your Learning*, Faith, Hope, Patience, waiting upon God, keeping his ways, and comfort in so doing, strength, courage to do, to suffer; and *whatsoever* things Doctrinal, Preceptive, Promissory, Historical, all written, all written *for you*, for *your learning*: Ergo, sure they may read them, and hear them. The next is *Joh.* 20. 31. But these are *written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name.* This Gospel was the last written (our Books tell us) upon the request of some *Asian* Presbyters for the good of the Churches. And against the *Ebionites*, and *Cerinthians*, and such like who denied the Deity and satisfaction of our Lord Jesus; sure it was written for the Churches (and so to all, to the end); and it was written for their Knowledg of, Faith in, and Salvation by our Lord Jesus: these are expresly in the Text. So again, 1 *Joh.* 5. what a Chapter have we there, so sublime and heavenly! yet in the 12. he tells us that these things are written to Believers, to all Believers, that they *might know that they have eternal life*, v. 13. And so begins his Epistle *chap.* 1. when he had spoken something of their fellowship with the Father, and his Son Jesus Christ, *These things* (saith he) *I write unto you that your joy may be full*, v. 4. *Chap.* 2. 12. *I write to you little Children*; v. 12 to *you fathers, young men*, v. 13. The Epistle is high, yet very plain; it treats of the Blessed Trinity, Communion with the Father, and his Son Jesus Christ, cleansing by his Blood from all Sin, Remission of Sins through his name, the teachings and witness of the holy Spirit, and treats of these things so, that writing of them to all sorts for their good, together with the Doctrines written, is abundantly able to confound the *Romans*, and *Poland* adversaries abroad and at home.

What need I mention any more, that of the King, *Deut.* 17.19. he must write a copy of the Law, and it must be with him, *that he may learn to fear the Lord his God, and to keep all those words of those statutes to do them. Joshuah* must have the Book that *he may observe those precepts and prosper*, Josh. 1. 8, 9. It were endless to name all; I will form the Argument, and go to the next.

Thus it runs; The Truths which God appointed to be written on purpose that the People might read and hear for their Learning, Instruction, Faith, Obedience, Comfort, Joy; these Truths the People ought to read and hear; But the Bible is the Book wherein these Truths are written for that purpose: therefore they are to read and hear the Bible read one to another.

But 2*ly.* as they were written for them; so they were written to them, not to the Clergy, but the People especially. *Rev.* 2. 30. the Seven Epistles to the Seven Churches written to them for their good: *What thou seest, write in a Book and send it to the Seven Churches in Asia*; saith the Lord Christ to *John*, *Rev.* 1. 11. So *Jude* v. 1. So *Peter* his second Epistle, *I write unto you, in both which I stir up your minds by way of remembrance.* Thus he writes to *them* and *for them*, 2 *Epist.* c. 3. *v.* 1, 2. So *Paul*, *to the Saints at* Rome, *to them at* Corinth; *to the faithful in Christ Jesus at* Ephesus. So in the rest as every Child knows. Now when God gives his Truth by Inspiration, and appoints it to be written, as profitable to conviction, to conversion, to instruction in righteousness, that his People may be throughly furnished to every good work and word; what audaciousness, what wickedness is it for any sinful man to interpose and hinder this, and that by a Law, and that under a curse? Shall some mighty Prince signifie his Will to the People under him of the greatest concernment in the World for their advantage, and shall any man stand up and forbid them to read it, or hear it read, and punish them with death for having a transcript in their houses? Search and look into stories whether such a thing was ever done under Heaven. *Ambrose* saith that *Scriptura est Epistola Dei ad creaturas*; and behold here is one that opens his mouth against Heaven, and establisheth wickedness by a Decree, expressly forbidding all men of all degree to read or keep this letter. Is not this he to whom the Dragon gave his Power, his Seat, and great Authority? to whom was given a mouth speaking great words and blasphemies, and to continue two and forty months, *Revel.* 13. Well, the Argument is this, They to whom God appoints the Scriptures to be written they are to read and hear them read; But the Scriptures were thus written to the People: Therefore they are to read them.

The next thing is to evidence our Assertion by the judgment of the Ancient Fathers; but that seems needless, for their own do confess that the Fathers to a man were of our perswasion and practice. *Claud. Espencæus* a learned man tells us of himself, *Equidem in Patribus Orthodoxis*,

doxis per Dei gratiam, &c. Truly, saith he, by the Grace of God I have been *conversant in the Orthodox Fathers*, and marvel very much (*non potui non mirari*), that the custom of reading Scriptures by the People should now be accounted *capital* and *pestilent*, which to the Ancient Orthodox Fathers seemed so *commodious* and *profitable*, Espen. *Com. in Tit. c. 2. pag. 266.* If it be said, That this Bishop was before the Council of *Trent*, and that possibly if he had been in that Convocation he would have been of another mind. There were learned men there more excellent, that might have better informed him. To this I answer, I will give you one instance for all, a little after that Council, and it is worth your observation.

About the year 1560, Bishop *Jewel* preaching at *Pauls-Cross*, before a very great and Venerable Assembly makes this offer; That if any man alive, or men whatsoever of the Popish side, could prove by any *one plain sentence* out of *Scriptures*, or *Fathers*, *ancient Doctors*, or *General Councils*, for the first six hundred years, any one of the *seven and twenty Articles*, which he there rehearsed, he would *then yield and submit.* Among these Articles the fifteenth concerns our business; it runs thus, *If any one can prove by Scriptures, Fathers, Doctors, Councils, for the first six hundred years, that the Lay-people were forbidden to read the word of God in their own tongue, I will yield and submit.* Great discourse (you must think) arose upon this among all sorts; for such a man (indeed incomparable) to make such an offer so seemingly daring, in such a place so publick, in such a way as in a publick Ordinance of God, before such an Assembly so solemn and learned, great discourse there was no doubt. Some few months after he comes into the same place, and remembers the Audience of his proffer with a great deal of Christian humility; and modestly tells them, It was not *vain-glory or self-confidence* (for what was he?) but the vindication of Truth, the Glory of Christ, and the Salvation of Souls that had engaged him in this business. Then and there he repeated the same Articles, and renewed the same proffer. Whisperings, censurings, railings there were great store in private concerning him, but no man makes an attempt to answer him. The Bishops Apology for the Church of *England* is printed, and translated into several Languages, dispersed abroad in *France* and *Spain*, and other parts. One of the many notable home-learned passages I have transcribed to our purpose. *If we be Heretick*s (as they would have us called) *and they be Catholicks*, why *do they not convince and master us by the Divine Scriptures*, as Catholick Fathers have always done? Why do they not *lay before us* how we *have gone away from Christ, from the Prophets and Apostles*, and from the Holy Fathers? why *are they afraid* of this, why *stick they at this? I pray you what manner of men be they which fear the judgment of Gods word?* that are afraid of the holy Scriptures? and do prefer before them their own dreams, and cold inventions? and to *maintain their own Traditions*, have defaced, and *corrupted* now *these many hundred years* the

Ordi-

Ordinances of Christ and the Apostles. This is somewhat close and warm. Well, but still here is a great silence; Dr. *Cole* (late Dean of *Pauls*) a man reputed learned, enters into a Letter-combate with him; the Bishop begs of him to give one Father, one Scripture, one Doctor. *Good* Mr. Dr. (saith he) *do not deceive the People their Souls be precious.* The Dr. sends him back a taunt, a quibble, but never a word of Scripture, Council, or Father: he pretends he was afraid of forfeiting his *recognisance*; No, no, (replys the Bishop) there is no fear of that, why should you fear the forfeit of your *recognisance* more for quoting *Austin* and *Chrysostom*, than for quoting *Horace*, and *Virgil*. At last about five years after out comes Dr. *Harding* and his fellows, and when he and they (for you may be sure the main strength of *Rome* was engaged in this quarrel) come to make their reply to this fifteenth Article, the words are these, I will read them to you in their own expressions; *That the Lay-people were then forbidden to read the Scriptures in their own Tongue, I find it not.* This is honest however, but then the next clause is knavish, *Neither do I find they were commanded to read. Ans.* The Fathers did not take upon them to command, but they pressed the Command of Christ; that clause was impertinent on purpose to beguile the Reader. The Fathers did exhort the People vehemently for reading, and rebuked them sharply for not reading. Give me a roll of Parchment as long as my arm, of the ordinary bredth, and I dare undertake a man shall fill it full within and without with the Sayings of the Fathers to our purpose in a short time, indeed the work is done already to our hands; our Reverend Fathers have wrought hard with great judgment and success, we have (or might have) entred upon their labours. Is it not a fault amongst us that we make no more use of so shining lights, I will name a few. Bishop *Jewel* in his *Reply and Defence*. *Morton in his Appeal*. *Whitaker de Scriptura*. Dr. *White* his way and defence. *Cartwright* on *Rhem. Pref.* the Renowned *Du Plessis*, and the great *Chamier*. What an abundance of Sayings of the Fathers have they quoted for the Peoples reading and hearing of the Scriptures within this hundred years and upward! and none hath adventured to gain-say them therein, that I know. But you will say, Do not the learned Papists (for there are learned men amongst them) give some answer to the Scriptures you quote, and the old Doctors too? I answer, there be four Questions I have to speak to, before we come to speak something of translating the Scriptures; and this Question shall be the first, the second is, What Artifices they do use to bring People out of conceit with the Scriptures; the third is, What Objections they usually bring against us; the last, What may be the design in all this. And I shall here make use of the Fathers.

First then, What have they to say? I answer, to that Scripture, which is a principal one, *Joh. 5. 39. Search the Scriptures*, they would fain have it to be the *Indicative Mood*, not the *Imperative*, to be a *practice*, not a *pre-*

a *precept.* Poor men! they would get little by this if it were ſo, for this practice was lawful and commendable, and then Chriſt appeals to the Scriptures in which they were practiſed, to which they did pretend; their own Dr. Biſhop *Eſpencæus* thinks it a very great ſhame, that the *Jews* did practiſe themſelves, and train up their Children in the knowledg of the Scriptures, and Chriſtians did neglect it. Yea, but they would willingly ſhift it off from being a Command, for then it is ſtill binding, and People that have any ſenſe of God, and their Souls, and any thoughts of another World will conceive it is their Duty, let all the Popes in the World ſay what they will to the contrary. This is that which pincheth, therefore they would by any ſhift or wriggle put it off from being a Command; but it will not be. The Fathers take the words in the Imperative, *Utinam omnes faceremus*, Would to God *we would all do that which is written. Search the Scriptures*; Origen. *in Iſa. Hom.* 2. ἐκέλευσεν ἐρευνᾶτε, he commands us, *Search the Scriptures*, Athanaſ. *Tom.* 2. *pag.* 248. *Com.* ἐντολὴ δοθῇ, when a Commandment is given let us obey our Lord. *Baſil. Chryſoſtom* the ſame; ſo *Theophylact* his follower the ſame, διδάσκων πῶς δυνήσονται, teaching of them how they might have the Word of God abiding in them: he ſaith, *Search the Scriptures*, *Theoph. in loc.* There needs no more; for *Janſenius* doth confeſs it, *Communiter quidem accipitur ut ſit imperativi modi*, 'tis commonly taken *for a Command: Non dicit legite*, he *doth not ſay read*, but ſearch; *Non has aut illas ſed omnes*, not *this or that, but all the Scriptures*, *Law and Prophets*, Conc. *c.* 36. *in loc.* So doth *Maldonate*, *Theophylact*, *Auguſtine*, *& omnes opinor præter Cyrillum graves authores.* All grave Authors I ſuppoſe, except *Cyril*, take theſe words for a Command, *In eo enim vis Teſtimonii & gratia Orationis conſiſtit.* Why ſo, *ad ſuas ipſorum Scripturas mittit*; Chriſt *ſends them to their own Bibles*, In *quibus omnem illi gloriam ſuam collocabant*, of *which they chiefly gloried.* As if he ſhould ſay, *Quandoquidem tantum Scripturis tribuitis*, ſince you *aſcribe ſo much to the Scriptures*, that in them *you think* to *have eternal life*, ſearch the *Scriptures*, and all things do well agree, they teſtifie of me. *Chryſoſt. & Euthymius bene adnotarunt non dicit legite ſed ſcrutamini*, Maldon. *in loc.* So that this Text doth ſtand for a Commmand from Chriſt, and the countermand ſtands (among others) for a brand of Antichriſt. But ſoft, not ſo haſty; *Stapleton* and others ſay, Chriſt there ſpeaks to the Scribes and Phariſees, and they were to ſearch the Scriptures *by their Office:* This they prove by *v.* 33. *You ſent unto John*; now the Scribes and Phariſees ſent unto *John*, therefore to them he ſpeaks. *Anſ.* The Chapter ſpeaks not a word of the Scribes and Phariſees, but of the *Jews*; beſides, the Scribes and Phariſees did not ſend unto *John* but the *Jews.* The Text is expreſs, *Joh.* 1. 19. *The Jews ſent Prieſts and Levites from Jeruſalem to John.*

As to the Fathers urging the Bible upon the People, they ſay, 'Tis true; but ſay they (*Sixtus Senenſis*, and others), *Patres diſpenſarunt, indulſe-*

dulserunt libertatem, *Ans.* Out upon it, a meer forgery to cheat the simple, *Venia & indulgentia locum non habet ubi non præcesserit prohibitio*; That is *Chamiers* Answer, an Indulgence doth presuppose a Prohibition. How could the *Fathers indulge that* that was *never forbidden?* Was the reading or hearing of the Bible ever forbid by the Fathers or Christian Magistrates in their time? Indeed *Antiochus* did burn it, and *Julian* scoffed at it, and *Diocletian* did burn it also; but of Christians never any did so, the destroyers and prohibiters of Scriptures are of another sort; they do like the Pagan Princes, *Antiochus* and *Diocletian*.

But they plead the Fathers; They say the Fathers (as *Jerom* and *Austin*) say the Scriptures are obscure and hard to be understood; and from thence infer, That in the judgment of the Fathers the Lay-people should not meddle with them. *Ans.* 'Tis true, most of them urge this, but very sophistically, and indeed wickedly. *Austin* saith that the Scripture like a familiar friend speaketh those things it containeth to the heart, *Doctorum & Indoctorum*, of the *Learned*, and *the Unlearned*, *Epist.* 3. The Scriptures are easie to be understood, and exposed to the capacity of every Servant, Plowman, Artificer; so *Chrysostome*, *Cyril*, *Jerom*, *Isidore*, and indeed all to the same purpose. True they say (as we do), That there are some things obscure to stir up diligence, frequency, prayer. Some Scriptures are dark, therefore Christians must pray more, and read more attentively, diligently; that is the Inference of the Fathers; Therefore they must not read at all; that is the Inference of the Jesuits. What sophistry, how bald is this, fit to be hissed out of the company of rational men. *Chrysostome* is most earnest upon all sorts, Artificers, Tradesmen, Men, Women, Young, Old, to be much in Reading and Hearing, answers all their shifts, tells them that they have more need than others, than Students, than Monks, because they are *in the midst of many temptations*. Our Divines cite him much, the Compiler of our Homilies, quotes scarce any Father besides. What say the Jesuits to this? why some say, He dealt like a *Pulpit-man*, not *like a Reader in a Desk*, like an *Orator*, not a *Disputant*. Others, He was a vehement man. Others, That he spake Hyperbolically; that is, He spake more than was needful. Whereas the truth is, The Angels would sooner want words wherewith to commend, than the Bible want worth to commend it self. But of all men the *Rhemists* are most impudent, who would make as if *Chrysostome* were so vehement only or mainly to take People off from Cards and Dice, and Stage-plays; whereas *Chrysostomes* great business is to take them from their excuses of their Families, Trades, Callings; *Rhemists* Preface to their Annotations, with *Cartwrights* Answer, see there at large. To conclude this, the Fathers speak of the Scriptures according to the Scripture; *viz.* That they are a *Light*, a *Lamp*; a *Light* that *shineth*, that they give *Understanding* to the *simple*: If men speak not according to them it is because there is no light in them, yet these men reject all. Some few are constrained to confess

confeſs that in points generally to be believed the Scriptures are *plain*; but yet they will not yield at any hand that they ſhall come into the hands of the People, you ſhall hear their reaſons by and by.

The ſecond Queſtion is, What Artifices their Learned Men do uſe to debaſe the Scriptures, that the People may have a vile eſteem of them, bring them to diſdain and loath them? I anſwer, many ways by Word and Deed; firſt by Word, Shall I ſay they diſparage them? Sure enough, they blaſpheme, they call them *a dead Letter*, *a dumb Judg*, *Theologiam Atramentariam*, Inken Divinity; (do you hear ye Quakers who were your Tutour) a *Lesbian Rule*, a *Noſe of Wax without the Pope* (ſaith *Car. Hoſius*) they have no *more Authority than Æſops Fables*, non plus Authoritatis quam Æſopi Fabulas: Here is a *Rabſhakey* whom the *Babyloniſh* King hath preferred to a Red-Hat to blaſpheme the Living God; the ſame man compares *David's Pſalms* to *Ballades*, with a verſe out of *Horace*, *Scribimus indocti doctiq; Poemata paſſim*; which the excellent Biſhop Engliſheth thus, *we write Ballades Tag and Rag.* Dr. *White* in the way tells us that *Pereſius* ſaid, that he thought verily it was the Devils invention *to permit the people to read the Bible*; Is not this enough to ſcare and affright poor ſouls from touching it, or attending to it? *Martin. Pereſius de Trad. p.* 44. And *Thyrræus* ſaith, that he knew certain Husbandmen *poſſeſſed of the Devil*, becauſe being *but Husbandmen they were able to diſcourſe of the Scriptures: Thyrræus de Dæmoniac. c.* 21. *Theſ.* 257. Methinks here I have an *idea* of a Frier Preaching, that *Reading Scripture is the way to be poſſeſſed of the Devil.*

2. By Deeds and Practice, and that many ways.

1. They *cry up* the good of Ignorance; they tell us it is more *rewardable* to be *ignorant than knowing*, they require no knowledg of the things we pray for: The Jeſuites tell us after a long harangue in ſome things impertinent, and in others very falſe, that devout People may, and ought, in their *ancient right*, *ſtill uſe their Latin Prayers*, Beads, and Primars as ever before, *notwithſtanding* what *Paul* ſaith, in the 1 *Cor.* 14. And that they doubt not but it is acceptable to God, and available in all *their neceſſities*; *nay more*, *that they pray with great conſolation* of ſpirit, and with as great devotion and affection, nay oftentimes *more than they* that Pray *in the Vulgar Tongue.* Well, and what Prayers be theſe? Why they be Prayers, Pſalms, and holy Words: They are the *Pater Noſter*, the *Ave Maria*, the *Creed*, *Our Ladies Mattins*, and the *Letanies*, and the like: Oh! the impudence of men, that have made their Faces harder than a Rock, to Print ſuch things as theſe: *Rhem. Annot.* on the 1 *Cor.* 14. So alſo they require no ability to profeſs their Faith, if they were to ſuffer for it; if a Catholick *called before the Commiſſioners*, *hath courage to ſay* I am *a Catholick*, he *defendeth himſelf ſufficiently* (though he can ſay no more) and that I will *dye a Catholick*; But what if the Commiſſioners ask him a reaſon of his Faith, he anſwers enough, by telling them that *the Church can give them a rea-*

ſon of all their demands, *Rhem. Annot. Luke* 12. 11. They ſay that Ignorance in moſt things, is *beſt of all*,--- to know nothing is to *know all things*. Hoſius.

2. They cry up to the skies an Implicite Faith (this is diſtinct from the other, though near a-kin) this is the Colliers Faith, and doth wonders. The Story is, the Collier was ſick, and being at the point of death, he was tempted of the Devil what his Faith was; the Collier anſwered, *I believe and dye in the Faith of Chriſts Church:* Being demanded by the Devil, what the Faith of the Church was, *that Faith* (quoth he) *that I believe in*; and thus clearly baſled and non-pluſſed the Devil. He put him to flight ſaid *Staphylus*, I ſhould not have believed this Story (ſaith my Author) upon the report of ſuch a baſe companion as *Staphylus*; but when I ſaw the ſame conceit ſet forth as gravely by Learneder *Cleardes* than that renegate (ſo Biſhop *Jewel* calls him); then I conceived that the Colliers Faith was *Canonized* for the Papiſts Creed: Theſe learned men were no leſs than *Alb. Pighius*, *Hierarch. lib.* 1. *cap.* 5. *p.* 38. and *Hoſius cont. Proleg. Brentii*, *lib.* 3. *p.* 136. with two other conſiderable men. Dr. *Cole* ſhall conclude this, with what he did once conclude the convocation at *Weſtminſter*, in the beginning of Queen *Elizabeth:* The Story in ſhort is this. A Diſputation is appointed by the Council at *Weſtminſter* (ſaith *Fuller* in his Hiſtory); Nine Popiſh Biſhops and Doctors on that ſide; Eight Proteſtant Doctors on the other ſide, Sr. *Nicholas Bacon* Lord Keeper, Moderatour: The firſt queſtion was about ſervice in an unknown Tongue, the firſt Day paſſed with the Proteſtants; the ſecond Day the Popiſh Biſhops and Doctors fell to cavilling againſt the order agreed on: (Alas what ſhould they do, they could not now, *Petere argumenta ex officinis carnificum*;) They fell to ſaucineſs as well as diſorder, the meeting is diſſolved, Dr. *Cole* ſtands up and tells that honourable Aſſembly, thus with a loud voice, *I tell you* (ſaith he) *that Ignorance is the Mother of devotion:* So ſaid the *Valentinians* of old, as *Iræneus* tells us, that the Ignorance of Truth is knowledg, *lib.* 2. *c.* 19.

3. They have one trick more to debaſe the Scriptures, and dull the edge of peoples affections to them, ſome of their Doctors write moſt unworthy things of the Bible, as before; theſe they applaud, that ſo they may inſtil ſlily and inſenſibly into the minds of men by their Authority, a very coarſe eſteem of the Word of God: As for example, *Catharinus* teſtifieth of Cardinal *Cajetan*, that he denied the laſt chapter *of St. Mark*, *ſome parcels of St. Luke*, *the Epiſtle to the* Hebrews, the Epiſtle of *James*, the ſecond Epiſtle of *Peter*, *the ſecond and third Epiſtles of* John, and the *Epiſtle of* Jude; this *Man they applaud* very highly, call him the *incomparable Divine*, fill their people with high *admirations of him*, and then publiſh in their Books theſe things; and ſo inſtil by drops an evil opinion of the Scriptures: And if the Proteſtants object this to them, they put it off, ſaying, he was but a *private*

vate Doctor, what is that to *their Church*. The Priests and Friers tell the people what *Hosius* and others their admired men say of the Scriptures, *a dark, lame, mute, dumb, sorry Book*; and all this to disparage the Holy Truth of God, and to keep poor Souls in Ignorance, which they do by this means, both Priest and People. Their very Priests understand not their own Mass-Books; A Young Man within these three Months, entered into Discourse with some Priests at *Malaga* in *Spain*, he saluted them in Latin, and proposed some Questions in Latin to them, they understood never a Word. Archbishop *Spotswood* tells us in his History of *Scotland*, that the Cardinal persecuted men in *Angus*, for reading the *New-Testament*: And 'tis said the Ignorance of these times was so great, that even the *Priests did think that the New-Testament was one of* Martin Luthers *Books*, *H. Sc. ad annum* 1544. He tells us also of a great contention among the Church-men, whether the *Pater Noster* might be said to the Saints; it was brought to the University, they, some of the Doctors said it might be said to God *formaliter*, to the Saints *materialiter*; to God *principaliter*, to the Saints *minus principaliter*; to God *capiendo stricte*, to Saints *capiendo large*: The Doctors meet several times, and not agreeing, it was referred to a Provincial Synod to be decided. When the Synod convened, the question was agitated again, at last it was resolved that the *Pater Noster* might be said to saints. *Hist. Scot. Anno* 1553. 'Tis impossible to conceive what a thick fogg, and mist of ignorance and darkness was upon the Souls of the people; I will mention but one Story from Dr. *White* upon his own experience, it is this; he saw and learned (dwelling among them) how they said their Prayers; the Creed thus, *Creezum zuum Patrum onitentem creatorum ejus anicum Dominum nostrum qui cum sons Virgini Mariæ crixus fixus Douche Pilati.* and so on, to *Eccli Catholi remisserue peccaturum communiorum, obliviorum bitam* and *turnam* again. It would make a mans heart tremble (saith my Author) at their most horrid ignorance; yet to hear them pronounce their Prayer it moves laughter, and I confess upon this account I durst not Preach it: In him you may see a great deal more of this pitiful stuff, *The way to the True Church*, in the Preface to the Reader. The Jesuit in his *Answer* calls him to an account for this; but in his *Defence* he tells the Jesuit that is the case of the better sort as well as the poor, they are all ignorant, and say their Prayers much at one rate, and this saith he I will stand to, if all the Seminaries in *England* had it in chase: My experience of some (saith he) allows me to speak that the Ignorance is general. *Defence c.* 12. He asked an Ancient Woman what Jesus Christ was; She told him she could not tell, but sure it was some good thing, it would not have been with the Lady else in her Creed; but no more.

4. Lastly, They take this way to put down the Scriptures, *sc.* by destroying and burning them, and those that love them: I will give three or four instances, the first, King *Henry* the Eighth writes to the

French King for Licence to Print the *Bible* in *Engliſh* in *Paris*, becauſe there was ſtore of Paper and good Workmen, as alſo to *Bonner* then Leiger in *France* to further it; this was by the means of *Cromwell*, at great charges it is effected; but by the means of *Gardiner* and his fellows ſeized and burned openly in the Maulbert place in *Paris*, 2500 Bibles burned at one fire. See *Fox* his *Martyr.* there is much more to this purpoſe.

Upon the perſecution of the Duke of *Guiſe* againſt the Proteſtants, at *Amiens* all the *Bibles*, *Teſtaments*, *Pſalters*, were ſought for and openly burnt, at *Troys* the *Bibles* were all rent and torn in pieces, at *Angees* they openly burnt the *Bibles* in the Market-place; one fair gilt *Bible* was hung upon an Halberd, and carried in Proceſſion, the Papiſts ſaying, Behold, Truth hanged, the Truth of the *Hugenots*, the Truth of all the Devils, with much collected by Mr. *Clark* in his *Martyrol.* In *Ireland* (within memory) the *Bible* was, dragged, kennelled, cut, torn, ſtampt upon. Biſhop *Jewel* tells of a Martyr in Q. *M.* pleaded the Scripture before the Biſhop in his own defence; the Biſhop turning to a Juſtice ſaid, nay, if he prates of the *Bible*, we ſhall never have done; *habemus Legem*, we have a Law (ſaid he) and by our Law he ought to die. *Rep.* to *Cole.* *John Porter* a young Man, reads in the *Bible* ſet up in *Pauls* by *Bonner* in the Lord *Cromwell*'s time; when *Cromwell* was dead, *Bonner* ſends for him, accuſes him for expounding the *Bible* to the people, *Porter* denies any ſuch thing; *Bonner* ſends him to *Newgate* where he is loaded with Irons, hands and leggs, and a Collar of Iron about his neck, by a friends means to the Keeper he is ſomewhat eaſed, and put among the Felons, whom he reproves, and inſtructs, being well acquainted with the Scriptures; he is complained of, the Biſhop commands him into the Dungeon, 'tis thought he was put into the Engine called the Devil in the Neck: In the night he was heard to groan ſadly, in the morning found dead.

A poor Bookſeller in *Avignion* was burned to Aſhes, for ſetting to ſale ſome *French Bibles*, his defence worthy the reading, his queſtions utterly ſilencing the Biſhop of *Aix*, with the reſt of the Prelates; they gnaſhed upon him with their Teeth, and cried, To the fire preſently: He was led to his execution with two *Bibles* about his neck, one hanging before, the other behind, as ſhewing the cauſe of his condemnation; ſo the good Man and the *Bibles* were burnt together. *Fox Mar. H.* 8.

A Woman of *Sanſay* in *France*, was accuſed by her Servant for having a *Bible* in her Houſe, in reading whereof was her whole delight; the Maid Servant complains of this to the Jeſuites; the Jeſuites complain to the Judges, ſhe was apprehended, and impriſoned; the Judges told her, if ſhe would confeſs upon the Scaffold that ſhe had broken the Law, and caſt her *Bible* into the fire, ſhe ſhould have her life: We would have you (ſaid they) imagin it to be but Paper, and you may buy

buy another, only throw this into the fire to give the Jesuites content, thus they laboured to perswade her for the space of two hours: *What a scandal shall I give said she to the People to burns Gods Book? No certainly, I will never do it, I will rather burn my Body than my Bible*: Upon this she was committed close Prisoner, fed with bread and water, at last condemned to be set upon the Scaffold, her Bible burnt before her face; her self to be strangled, her body to be dragged through the Streets to a dunghil, which was accordingly done.

A Woman in *Ireland* required by *Fitz Patrick* to burn her *Bible*, She told him that she would rather die than burn her *Bible*; whereupon the Sabbath day morning after this, She and her Husband were cruelly murthered: But the murtherer, tormented in Conscience, and dogged (as he conceived) and haunted with apparitions of them, with inward horrour pined away. *Cla. Mar. Fran. Ireland.*

There is no end of these sad Stories, Dr. *Story* shall conclude; Thou prateſt (said he to a Martyr) of the *Bible*, bibble, babble, all is bibble babble, thou shalt prate at a Stake. So much of the second Question.

The Third is this, What Objections do they make against reading, and having Scripture? They are men of Learning, some of them give some Reason for their proceedings.

Answ. They do so, and you shall hear them fairly proposed, I will not wrong them.

The first is this; Cast not holy things to *Dogs*, *nor Pearls before Swine*; therefore the People must not have the use of *Bibles*. Answer, Verily this Argument is so horribly injurious to the Wisdom and Mercy of God, and so inhuman and barbarous to the rationality of Man, that one would think it were rather slanderously and designedly imposed upon them, then proposed by them; But it is notoriously true in all their Books: *Harding* and his fellows alledg it in their Aswer to Bishop *Jewel*. *Hosius* doth the same also. The Jesuites in their Preface to the *Rhem. Annot.* but more subtilly and slily; and are rebuked sufficiently by Mr. *Car.* *Salmeron* and *Costerus* gives the same reason why the People are not to know the Church-Traditions, they must be kept lockt and safe in the Popes Breast; the Pope is not to let the people know Traditions, or at least doth not, because Holy things must not be thrown to Dogs. *Canus* doth the same, and because he speaks out, I will write his words, *Si Apostoli quibus formis sacramenta essent conficienda, quibusq; ritibus administranda, aliaq; id genus religionis secreta passim vulgo tradidissent, quid esset aliud quam adversus Christi legem sanctum dare canibus & inter porcos spargere margaritas? imo quid esset aliud quam omnia mysteria Christianæ Religionis abolere? nec enim mysterium est quod ad populares aures effertur. Hæc itaq; prima ratio est cur Apostoli quædam sine scripto tradiderunt, nempe, ne aut ab ethnicis irriderentur sacra nostra aut*

vulgo

vulgo etiam fidelium venirent in contemptum : The long and short is this, That the Apostles *did by word of mouth deliver the secrets* of the *Gospel to some men*, and did *not write and preach the whole* of Faith and Duty to the Churches; for if they had done so, they had gone against the Command of Christ, who saith, *Give not holy things to Dogs, and cast not Pearls before Swine*; *Can. Lib.* 3. *c.* 3. *com. Loc.* Thus the poor People whose Souls are immortal and precious, the People that are the Church of God, for whom Christ died to redeem with his Blood, for whom, and to whom the Scriptures were on set-purpose written, must have nothing; not the Scriptures, because holy things must not be given to Dogs, nor Traditions (which also contain matters of Faith and Worship) because Pearls must not be cast to Swine.

Mr. *Harding* and they with him tell us, that whereas the Hebrew Letters had no Vowels, the Seventy Elders only could read, and the people were kept from reading of it, as it is thought by the special Providence of God, that precious stones should not be cast before Swine, *Reply to the fifteenth Article*, a notorious daring untruth, for whether they had points or not is not to the question; sure enough the people could Read, for they were expresly commanded to Write the Words of the Law: *Deut.* 11. And they could Write a Bill of Divorce. *Paulus Fagius* saith, from the *Rabbins*, that through the whole Countrey every Town had a School, and that in *Jerusalem* there were some hundreds of Schools; And in so many Schools was there no Scholar did know his Letters? For him to say they could not Read, and that by a special Providence they were kept from it, and that, because holy things should not be cast to Dogs; What daring men are these? But the truth is, they will adventure upon any thing to serve their own turn, by keeping the people in midnight doleful Darkness.

Their second Obection is, The People will pervert the Scriptures, therefore they are justly prohibited; the good Old Gentleman out of his Fatherhood, takes away the Knife out of his Childrens hands, they will abuse themselves and cut their fingers.

Answ. This Objection is an Hundred year old, and Thirty to boot, and every-where among their Bishops and Jesuites to be found; but I stood amazed to read it of late, in a reply to Dr. *S.* It seems they think it is a very sharp Argument: Alas, one of the Martyrs in Q. *M.* broke the edge of it, indeed batter'd it all to pieces. The Story in short is this; *Stephen Gratwich* convented before Dr. *Watson* Bishop of *Winchester*, in St. *Maries Overies* in *Southwark*, tells the Bishop of his cruelty, in taking away the *New Testament* from him, which he had for the health of his Soul, which all men ought to have for their Souls comfort; and so he did treat them more like brute beasts, than Christian men: No (quoth the Bishop) we will use you as we will use the Child; for if the Child will hurt himself with the Knife, we will take away the Knife from him:

So

So becauſe you will damn your Soul with the *Bible*, you ſhall not have it. My Lord quoth *Gratwick*, this is a ſimple Argument to maintain and cover your ſin, are not you aſhamed to make the Word the cauſe of our damnation? But if your Argument be good, you may take away from us our Meat and Drink, becauſe ſome men do abuſe them; and you may make an Argument to take away all other mercies as well as the Scriptures: My Lords, quoth *Winchester*, we loſe time, this fellow is perverſe, he ſpeaks nothing but Sophiſtry, we ſhall get no advantage againſt him. Have at ye now, Wilt thou recant? I will pronounce ſentence. There, there it is, Who ſhall ſtand before this Argument?

But if perverting Scriptures, be any reaſon for the non-reading of them; then of all men in the World, the Popes, Cardinals, Prieſts, Jeſuites, ſhould be prohibited; of all men they ſhould never touch a *Bible*, inſtances are many: I will preſent you with a few. Dr. *Harding* and the *Lovainiſts* with him argue thus; The Son of Man came not to deſtroy, but to ſeek and ſave that which is; *Ergo*, in the Sacrament the Accidents of Bread and Wine remain without their Subjects. The Axe may not boaſt himſelf againſt him that lifteth it up; *Ergo*, no Man may dare to judg the Pope, if he leads thouſands of Souls to Hell; no Man may mutter, or ſay, *Domine cur ita facis*. To the pure all things are pure, to the unclean all things are unclean; *Ergo*, It is not lawful for Prieſts to Marry. Give not Holy things to Dogs, *Ergo*, Prayers muſt be in a ſtrange Tongue the people do not underſtand. I will ſprinkle clean Water upon you; *Ergo*, the Prieſt muſt ſprinkle the people with Holy Water. Chriſt ſaid, Without me ye can do nothing; *Ergo*, the Biſhop alone muſt conſecrate the Church. *Paul* ſaith, the Rock was Chriſt; *Ergo*, the Altar muſt be of Stone. The Earth is the Lords, the round World, and all that dwell therein; *Ergo*, the Hoſt or Sacramental Bread muſt be round. God made the Sun to rule the day, and the Moon the Night; *Ergo*, the Dignity of the Pope is Fifty ſix times bigger then the Emperours Dignity. The Thief upon the Croſs, repented himſelf of his Life; *Ergo*, the Prieſt at Maſs muſt fetch a ſigh, and knock his Breaſt. *Judas* kiſſed Chriſt; *Ergo*, the Prieſt muſt kiſs the Altar. Take the Money in the mouth of the Fiſh, and pay for me and thee; *Ergo*, the Pope is the Head of the Church. *Babylon* is a Cup of Gold in the hand of the Lord; *Ergo*, the Chalice muſt be of Silver or Gold. Thus I have given you a full dozen of inſtances, of their horrible abuſing of the Scripture; and if it were ſerviceable I could furniſh you with a dozen more, the greateſt abuſers of the Scripture that ever were, and the greateſt blaſphemers that ever were, in applying that to ignorant ſinful men, which is peculiar to the Lord Jeſus: As the Pope is the Light that cometh into the World; and the Ambaſſadours of *Sicilie* thus ſupplicate the Pope *Tu qui tollis peccata mundi*; Oh thou that takeſt away the Sins of the World have mercy upon us;

Oh

Oh thou that takeſt away the ſins of the World, *Dona nobis pacem*, Grant us thy peace. And theſe (with much more that might be added) I ſay theſe illogical non-ſenſical inferences, and blaſphemous applications are aſſerted, by Biſhop *Jewel* at *Pauls* Croſs; and *Chemnitius. Exam.*

3. They Object, That the Reading of the Scriptures or hearing them read breeds Hereſie, Therefore they ought not to have the uſe of them: This Objection is common amongſt all their writers; the Council of *Trent* (as was above ſaid) ſaith that the Scripture do more harm than good; what harm they do not tell, though they did reſolve to prohibit them, and did ſpightfully ſpeak againſt them; yet in their Decree they durſt ſay no more than that they did harm in general, and they could not for ſhame and policy ſay leſs, for then they had not mentioned any pretence for their prohibition: Why did not they ſpeak out and name the harm they did, by whom, in what Countrey, to whom, in what particulars? And all their ground is experience, *cum experimento manifeſtum ſit*; But whoſe experience is this? None ſure, but their own they found and felt, and feared more would follow, that the Scriptures had diſcovered to the World their Tyranny, Hereſie, and Idolatry, their Pride, Covetouſneſs, Filthineſs, and innumerable Villanies: This was the experience, and this is the riſe of their rage and enmity, and continueth ſo to this day amongſt ſome of them it may be feared to ſpiteful perſecution againſt knowledg.

Wo be to our Pariſh Prieſts, wo be to our Biſhops, wo be to our Prelates, ſaid a Learned Man of their own; yea, wo be to them indeed, they have not only taken away the Key of Knowledg, but they reproach it to be the key of Hereſie: Hereticks (ſaith Dr. *Harding* and his complices) ſuck in the venom of Hereſie out of the Scriptures; *Ergo*, if the people read the Scriptures, they will prove Hereticks. This is the common cry of them all, and Biſhop *Jewel* ſhall anſwer them all, the concluſion is this; every Man may read the Jeſuites and Prieſts Books, but Gods Book they may not read; every Man may read the Jeſuites and Prieſts Books without danger, but the Book of God they cannot read without danger; would you know the reaſon (ſaith he)? the Reaſon is this, Gods Book is full of Truth, and their Books are full of Lies.

The Scripture breeds Hereſie, even as much as Light breeds Darkneſs, or Phyſick Diſeaſes; yea, but men do pervert them! that is anſwered before: Yea, but now Hereſies are abroad, therefore it is not ſafe! And were there not Tradition-mongers and Hereſies in Chriſts time? Were not falſe Teachers very many and in very many points, and thoſe very dangerous and deſtructive in the Apoſtles time? Were there not ſome that denied the reſurrection of the body, and turned all into an Allegory, of a riſing within us, then as well as now? And of late,

late the *Familists* and *Quakers?* Did not some deny the Deity of our Lord Jesus, the *Ebionites* and others then, as well as the *Socinians* now? Did not some let go the Head Christ and introduce a wicked practice of Worshipping of Angels, through the pretence of Humility, *Holding not the head*, *Col.* 2. Were there none that did overthrow the foundation, (if making Christ of none effect will overthrow the Foundation then sure they did it) by Justification by Works as a less principal cause. Certainly there were all these and others, yet the Apostles did never forbid the People reading Scriptures, for fear they might be infected. As if an Antidote should cause or occasion, (if you will have it so) I say occasion an infection; the Apostles did the contrary; *John* bids them *Try the spirits*; and *Paul* bids them *Try all things*; and *Jude* exhorts them *To contend earnestly for the Faith delivered once to the Saints: Take unto them the sword of the spirit which is the word of God*, Ephes. 6. 17.

It is to little boot to light up a Candle where the Sun shines; what should I name the Fathers, were there not Heresies in their times? Doth not *Irenæus*, and after him *Epiphanius* name them in numbers eighty? doth not *Austin* after them and others reckon up about eighty? Did they now forbid the People to read and search the Scripures? The clean contrary every one knows that knows any thing of them. Nay, they chide them because they were not skilful: The *Manichees and Hereticks deceive the simple, but if we had our senses exercised to discern good and evil, we might easily refute them; how shall we have our senses but by the use of the Scriptures and frequent hearing.* Chrysost. *Hom.* 8. *ad Heb.* *Nothing can deceive those that search the Scriptures, for they are a light.* Theoph. *de Lazaro.* ἅδην ἰχνύσι σοφίσασθαι, *which shining the thief is discovered*; ὁ κλέπτης φαίνεται καὶ ἐνέσκεται. *We must read the Scriptures*, omni studio, *that we may be skilful exchangers* (trapezitæ) *to discern between Gold and Copper.* So *Hierome* long before *Theophyl.* *Malleo Scripturarum, &c.* that we *beat out the brains of Heresies with the mallet of the Scriptures*, idem. It were tedious to tyth the Quotations of the Fathers to this purpose. The Scripture breeds Heresies; Nay, saith *Irenæus* 1450 years since to the mad, fantastick *Valentinians*; *Hæc omnia contulit*, &c. *The Ignorance of the word of God is the cause of all these Heresies.* This the holy learned Father pithily discourseth in many Chapters, *Lib.* 4. especially from the 11*th.* to the 17*th.* to confound the *Marcionites*, *Carpocratians* and other *Gnosticks*, That *it was the same God and Father Almighty Maker of the World then and now, and the same Lord Jesus the Saviour both now and then. That* Abraham *was saved by faith in Christ. Nemo cognoscit filium nisi pater, nemo cognoscit patrem nisi filius & quibuscunq; filius revelaverit; revelaverit enim non solum in futurum dictum est, quasi tunc inceperit verbum revelare Patrem cum de Maria natus, sed communiter per totum tempus positum est; ab initio enim filius assistens suo Plasmati revelat omnibus Patrem, quibus vult & quod vult & quemadmodum vult Pater*

& propter hoc in omnibus & per omnia unus Deus Pater, unus filius, & unus ſpiritus, una fides & una ſalus omnibus credentibus in eum. Cap. 14. *Propheta cum ergo eſſet* Abraham *& videret in ſpiritu diem adventus Domini & Paſſionis diſpoſitionem, per quem ipſe & omnes ſimiliter ut ipſe credidit, credunt Deo ſalvari inciperent, vehementer exultavit, novit, quod Deo beneplacuit filium ſuum dilectum & unigenitum præſtare ſacrificium in noſtram redemptionem*, lib.4. c.13.

And he ſaith alſo before, That the accurſed Hereticks *Gnoſticks* of all ſorts and names, did beget their Hereſies and ſpread them from the ignorance of the Scripture, *Hæc omnia contulit eis ignorantia Scripturarum & diſpoſitionis Dei: ſc.* in the Scriptures; *Nos autem & cauſam differentiæ Teſtamentorum, & rurſum unitatem & conſonantiam ipſorum, in his quæ deinceps futura ſunt referemus*, l.3 c.12.

But laſtly, If the Scriptures muſt not be read by the People, becauſe they will prevert them, and engender Hereſies, then of all the men in the World, Learned men, the Clergy, Popes, Cardinals, Jeſuits, Prieſts, Academicks, Miniſters ſhould not read them, for he muſt be a great ſtranger in Hiſtory, Primitive and Modern, and in common experience. Who doth not know, that theſe men in all ages have been the broachers of Errors and Hereſies, the falſe Apoſtles, the Miniſters of Satan? the *Gnoſticks* their Ring-leaders were they not learned? *Arrius*, *Pelagius*, *Photinus*, *Macedonius*, and the reſt; they were either Presbyters or Biſhops. Come to our times, look into *Poland* and *Tranſylvania* within theſe eighty years paſt, the *Socinuſſes*, Uncle *Lælius*, and Nephew *Fauſtus*, *Crellius*, *Smalcius*, *Volkelius*, and the reſt? the Miniſters of *Tranſylvania* were they Lay-people? Who did expound the ninth of *Iſaiah* and applied it to *Hezekiah*? and the 53 *Iſaiah* and apply it to *Jeremiah?* or the fifth of *Micah*, and apply it to *Zorobabel?* Who invented ſuch a trick as to ſay theſe Texts might be applied to Jeſus Chriſt, and ought to be ſo; *modo eminentiori*, a villainous trick in it ſelf, and very apt to deceive young Students? Who are thoſe that affirm, publickly affirm, That *Abraham* was not ſaved by Faith in Chriſt? are they Lay-men, they would take it very hainouſly if a man ſhould not ſay that they were learned men, admirable and incomparable men. Did the People in *Holland* revive and vent *Pelagianiſm?* Do the People in *England* contrary to the Scriptures and the Doctrine of the Church vent *Photinianiſm* or *Pelagianiſm?* I have reaſon to believe that brain-ſick *Quakeriſm* did not ariſe from the People, but from learned Seducers, that have a myſtery amongſt them to do any thing, or ſpread any falſity, ſo it be for the advance of the Catholick cauſe. *Sabbatarianiſm*, for the Saturdays Sabbath. *Antiſabbatarianiſm* againſt the Lords-day, *Jure Divino*. *Anabaptiſm* hath riſen from and been ſupported by men of Learning.

The fourth and laſt Objection they make, or that I ſhall name, is the *obſcu-*

obscurity of the Scriptures. The *Scriptures* are obscure and dark, therefore *the Lay-people* shall not read them. This also is a common thredbare baffled Argument, how do they prove the Antecedent? Why, *There are some things dark and hard to be understood in Pauls Epistles.*

Ans. Though there be some few dark places in *Paul* and other Scriptures, yet generally they are plain, and there is nothing dark in those few places that concerns Faith and Holiness; but the same is abundantly plain in other Texts; some places are obscure, most places are plain and facile: *Ergo*, the People must read none at all; this is the proper but most absurd Inference of the Jesuits. Some Texts are somewhat dark, therefore the people should read the oftner, pray the more, compare Text with Text, consult and confer the more, be well skilled and setled in the Doctrines of Faith and Practice in plainer places the more. These Inferences are proper and natural, but that they should not read at all is such a wild doltish *non sequitur*, that nothing can be more.

David saith, *That they are a Light, a Lamp, that they enlighten the eyes, give understanding to the simple:* Yet how little was there of the Bible in *Davids* times, no more but the five Books of *Moses*, and two or three other Books, and these mostly Historical; what a light and glory shining is there now by the Accession of *Solomon*, the History of the Kings, the Prophets, Evangelists, Apostles? and yet shall bold men reproach them, and say, They are dark? 'Twill be tedious to you and me to quote Fathers in this Point; take two or three; *Universæ Scripturæ & Propheticæ & Evangelicæ, sunt in aperto; & sine ambiguitate & similiter ab omnibus audiri possunt:* Prophets and Apostles are without ambiguity, and may be heard (understood) of all. *Irenæus lib.* 2. *c.* 46. He discourseth against the *Valentinians*, and the other *Gnosticks*, who would pick out a mystical meaning where it never was; and if that they met with any number, what wild work would they make with it for their fantastick *Æones*; much at the rate as the Papists out of *Pasce oves* collect the Popes Supremacy, and out of the Eighth *Psalm*, *Thou hast put all things under his feet:* &c. *Sub pedibus Pontificis Romani*, under the Popes feet. *Pecora campi*; The beasts of the field; that is, *Men on earth*, the fish of the Sea; that is, *Souls in Purgatory. Volucres cæli*, the birds of Heaven; that is, the *Souls in Heaven Canonized by the Pope.* Go to, saith *Irenæus* to the *Gnosticks*, with your wild notions: So say we to our Adversaries, *Scripturæ in aperto sunt*; The sense of the Scriptures is plain enough. So *Clem. Alexand.* perswades the Heathen to leave their Fables, which are much like the Popish Legends; and their Statues which they worshipped with uncouth Ceremonies, like the Popish Images; and invites them to Heavenly knowledg in the Prophets and Apostles. *Audite qui estis longe, qui estis prope, nullis celatum est verbum, lux communis innotescit omnibus, nullus est in verbo Cimmerius:* The word is evident, the light shineth, there is no darkness in the word; *Clem. Alexand. Orat. adhort. ad Gentes.* Whatsoever things are necessary are manifest in the Scrip-

tures; *Chryſoſt.* Dr. *Prideaux* in the Chair was wont to tell us, that *Scriptura eſt obſcura in aliquibus cognoſcendis a Theologo. Sed non eſt obſcura in credendis & agendis a Chriſtiano:* If the Scriptures be hid they are hid indeed to the Learned Papiſts. How do they write and determine contrary to one another? How plain is *Pighius* in the Point of Juſtification, and the Imputation of Chriſts Righteouſneſs, as alſo *Gropper* and the *Divines* of *Colen*, and long before them *Aquinas* alſo? How dark and ignorant, and ſhuffling is the Council of *Trent* in that great Point? *Canus* tells us that *Cornelius Mus* the Biſhop of *Bitonto* did affirm in the Council of *Trent*, That *Chriſt in the Supper did not offer Sacrifice*: *Chriſtum in cæna corpus ſuum & ſanguinem ſuum non obtuliſſe*: Chriſt did not offer up his Body and Blood at the Supper. A moſt undoubted Truth, and that that throws the Maſs with all its attendants upon the face, it gives a deadly blow to almoſt all of Popery; and this *Cornelius* was not alone in this point. But what ſay the Fathers to it? *Canus* tells us, That *jure a Patribus & univerſis Theologis exploſus eſt. Cornelius* and his opinion was juſtly *exploded and caſt out by the Fathers*, and all the Divines in the Council. They decree the contrary, and curſe the gain-ſayer. *Canus* undertaks to confute him, but indeed his Arguments are very watry and childiſh, *Can. in Com. loc. l.* 12. *c.* 12. There is ſcarce an Article in which they do agree among themſelves, no not in the Point of the Popes Supremacy. Men receive not the Truth in the love of it, and God juſtly lets them wander in the dark and believe a lie; the darkneſs is not in the Sun, but the eye is bleared and dim, the fault is not in the Object but in the faculty; the Scripture is light, but we are dark.

Object. *But they do not prohibit men to read ſo they have a Licenſe.*

Anſ. I told you before that this was a meer flam; and if men might have a Licenſe, yet it is and would be a meer Innovation, and a piece of Tyranny: But it is a very cheat, the Licenſes I have proved already are forbidden by *Paul* the 5. For the further diſcovery of this, let us obſerve what *Clement* the Eighth tells us in his obſervation upon this Decree of the Council; It is to be obſerved (ſaith he) concerning this Rule of *Pius the 4th. That no new power is granted to Biſhops or Inquiſitors to licenſe the buying, reading, or keeping the Bible in the vulgar tongue.* Seeing hitherto by the Commandment and Practice of the holy *Roman* and univerſal Inquiſition, all ſuch power of granting Licenſes hath been taken from them; that whatſoever the Pope and his Crew (ſaith Dr. *White*,) might make a ſhew of to blind the eyes of the World, yet in *very deed they meant no ſuch thing as a Licenſe at all.*

Ledeſiman hath written a Tract about this Queſtion, and he well underſtood their ſenſe; he tells us, *Quamvis aliquis bono animo, &c.* Although (ſaith he) any man with an honeſt mind ſhall deſire a Licenſe, and ſhall pretend that he deſires it for Devotion, and the profit of his Soul: *Si ſe dicat petere bono animo*; yet that of our Saviour may be anſwered to him, *Mat.* 19. *You ask you know not what, it is a fallacious*

devotion?

devotion; a *Zeal, but not according to knowledg*; or rather *it is a ſpirit of diviſion and error at all adventures*; *Concedendum non eſt*; no Licenſe is to be granted. Nay more (and ſomewhat dangerous too) *Radix iſtius petitionis eſt hæreſis*; Hereſie is the riſe and root of ſuch a requeſt; 'tis *hæreſis interior*; therefore they crave a Licenſe to read, becauſe they are ſick of an *inward hereſie*, (*quia hæreſi interiori laborant*,) becauſe they think the thing is neceſſary; and *it ought to be ſo, at leaſt* it is more *expedient, and the contrary* not to be lawful, *Lib. de Lect. S. S. Ling. vern.* So that it ſeems 'tis inward hereſie for a man to deſire leave to read the Bible. 'Tis inward hereſie to think that the Council of *Trent* hath done any thing inexpedient in forbidding people to read under pain of non-abſolution, or the Book-ſeller to ſell under ſuch a Penalty. In the *Taxa Cam. Apoſtol.* a man may buy an Indulgence for Inceſt under 12 *d.* But if a man ſell a Bible it is no leſs mulct than 1200. Duckets. The noble *Morney* ſhall conclude this, *Priſci patres, &c.* the Ancient Fathers did *chide* the People for not reading; the Council doth *curſe* them if they do read. Then, before the Art of Printing, Bibles were ſcarce and dear, now they might have plenty and cheap. They laboured to open the eyes of the People of God; theſe endeavour to put them out, and to keep them in ignorance all their days. And now I pray judg what is become of your Licenſe?

Queſt. the 4th. and laſt. What Deſign have the Papiſts in all this? Why do they thus vilifie, diſparage, prohibit the Scriptures, when their Decrees are ſo manifeſtly repugnant to and confuted by Scriptures, the Old Fathers, and univerſal Practice, and evident Reaſon; ſure they have ſome end that moves them to it.

Anſ. Yes, they have divers. Firſt, They reproach the Scriptures as lame and inſufficient, that they may advance their own Traditions: Traditions are not additions to the Word, ſaith *Canus*, *Quin potius ſunt Verba Divina non aliter ac illa quæ ſacris libris Scripta ſunt: Lib. 3. Com. loc. cap. ult.* So *Hoſius*, *Bannes*, *Bellarmine*, *Coſter*, *Alphonſ. a Caſtro*, with all the Herd ſpeak at this rate; and indeed it is time for the Pope to make a new Bible, for the Bible of God is his enemy, and therefore they are enemies to it; *I hate it, for it never ſpeaks good of me.* The Pope muſt beget Traditions, and the Jeſuits to cozen the People muſt name them Apoſtolical.

The Monks of *Hildebrands* breeding were kept back from the Scriptures, to the end that their rude wits might be nouriſhed with the husks of Devils, which are the cuſtomes of humane Traditions, (*Siliquis Dæmoniorum quæ ſunt conſuetudines*,) that being accuſtomed to ſuch filth they might not taſte how ſweet the Lord was. Biſhop *Uſher* out of *Waltram.* Anſw. to *Malonc.* *Hildebrand* was a fit tool for ſuch a work, a *Murderer*, a *Poyſoner* of *ſeveral Popes*, a *Necromancer*, *converſed with the Devil*, threw the *Hoſt* into the fire becauſe it would not *anſwer* his demands; as the Oracles were wont to do. See *Bale, Eng. Vot.* This

was

was the man that trampled Scripture, and advanced Traditions: And so it came down from hand to hand, from Monks to Friars, from them to Priests and Bishops; hence came the ungodly practice of keeping the Common-People from reading Scriptures, that they might be *drawn to humane Traditions.* Usher ibid.

The second Reason is to maintain their Pride, the Bishops state, the Priests imperiousness, to be accounted some great ones; to be called *Rabbi*, and *Magister noster*, they keep away the Scriptures that the People may depend upon them. I fear (saith *Erasmus*) that the People must *nihil attingere*, that is in plain *English*, Be sots and stocks, and brutes. The reason and ground of this is not so much the danger the People may run into by knowledg, (that is a sorry but wicked pretence,) *sed sui respectu*, they keep the People in ignorance (more than *Indians*,) upon their own account; *viz.* that they may be *looked upon as Oracles*, that the People may resort to them as Oracles, and may ask them what is the meaning of this, or that, and they in a proud Magisterial way may answer, Understand thus, (*sic senti, sic loquere*,) speak thus. To maintain their Pride and Statelinesse they make the People brutes to be led by the nose, and not Men to be masters of Reason.

The third Reason may be this, If the light comes in, the moth eaten, braided ware will easily be discovered; therefore you must keep the Shop dark, if the People have the Scriptures they will quickly desert us. Of all men to this purpose commend me to *Petrus Sutor*, *Cum multa palam traduntur observanda:* Whereas *many thing are openly taught to be observed, which are not to be had expressly in holy Scriptures*, will *not the simple people* (*Idiotæ hæc animadvertentes*,) observing these thing quickly *murmur and complain?* Will they not also easily be with-drawn from the *Ordinances of the Church when they shall find there is no such thing contained in the word of Christ?* Pet. Sut. *de Tralat Bibliæ cap.* 22. Indeed here is the nail upon the head; or rather the sow by the right ear.

Dr. *Harding* gives this as one Reason why the People must not have the Bible: *sc.* They will despise and make the *Simplicity of the Church and of all those things which the Church useth as pap and milk to nourish her tender Babes withal:* Hard. *Rep. art.* 15. That is, they will despise that which God would have them despise; *sc.* false Worship. The People by the light of the Scriptures will despise the antick, mimick postures, gestures, vestures in their superstitious idolatrous Worship in an unknown Tongue; therefore we will take a course, they shall not have them: They will see and know our Aves and Credo's to be no Prayers, our Ladies Letany, and Prayers to Saints, to be old Paganism revived; They will espy many a hole in our coat, they will contemn holy Church, and despise her pap, and we shall be made a scorn. Indeed here is the finger upon the sore, down goes *Diana*. In short, Bishop *Jewel* answers *Harding* thus: The People despise nothing but what should

ſhould be deſpiſed, for they deſpiſe nothing but Superſtition and Idolatry: *ibid.* But theſe are but private Doctors, therefore let us ſee what the Pope himſelf ſaith in the caſe, there is a very conſiderable paſſage to this purpoſe, and I find it quoted by Dr. *Stillingfleet*, and Dr. *Moulin.* The Story is this:

The Biſhops meet at *Bononia* to conſult with the then Pope, *Paul* the third, how the Dignity of the *Roman* See might be upheld, for now it began to totter: They offer many ways, at laſt they came to that which they thought the weightieſt of all; and therefore did propoſe laſt which was this: *viz.* That by all means as little of *the Goſpel as poſſible might be, might be read in the Cities* of his Juriſdiction, but eſpecially as *little as poſſible could be in the vulgar Tongue*; and that little that was in the Maſs *ſhould be ſufficient*, and that it ſhould not be permitted to *any mortal man to read more*; for as *long as men were contented with that little, things went well*, but quite otherwiſe ſince more *was commonly* read. For this in ſhort, is that Book (mark that) which *above all others have raiſed theſe tempeſts* and *whirlwinds with which we are almoſt carried away*; and in truth whoſoever diligently conſiders it and compares *it with what is done in our Churches, will find them very contrary* to each other, and our Doctrines not only *to be different* from it, but *repugnant* to it.

A very honeſt, true and ingenuous confeſſion; and indeed it is no hard matter to ſhew to every man, even the meaneſt capacity, how that their Doctrines (not only their Practices) but their very Doctrines are not only different but repugnant to the Sacraments, Lords-Prayer, the Creed, and the Ten Commandments: Here, here is the true reaſon for which they do vilifie Scripture, the People are *Lozels*, they might *meddle* with their *Meaſures* and *Diſtaffs*; they will *vent Hereſies, they are not fit*, they will cut their fingers, the holy Father would *ſuffer them to harm themſelves*; he will *chew* their *meat* firſt, and then they ſhall have their pap and milk. Theſe and ſuch like are meer pretences, the true cauſe is rendred by theſe Biſhops here at *Bononia.* This meeting (as I gueſs) was about twenty years after *Luther*, that man of God, (as he is called) began to preach, and ſome years before the Council of *Trent* began, and the Council out-did their advice, for they adviſed as little of the Goſpel to be read as might be, in the vulgar Tongue; but the Council decrees they ſhall have none at all, neither poor nor rich, neither man or woman, neither Prince nor Peaſant, neither Clerk nor Lay-man ſhall read it or have it in the Mother-tongue; as if the fear of *Cain* in ſome ſort were upon them, that whoſoever met them with a Bible ſhould kill them. So much for this.

Now laſtly to the third Point in this Controverſie to be debated; *viz.* That the Scriptures are to be tranſlated into vulgar Tongues, into the Peoples Language; for we have proved already they are to read and hear them, and that therefore they were written by Divine appointment for them, and to them; therefore they ought to be tranſlated.

ted. For what am I the better for the *Indian*-Bible, I know never a word? what would you be the better for a *Welsh* one, unless there be an Interpreter? Methinks the gift of Tongues, *Act.* 2. should convince any one; gifts are for others, for the work of the *Ministry*, that the Body may be *edified*, *Eph.* 4. by the gifts of Tongues did so many Nations; some of *Africa*, some of *Asia*, some of *Europe*, hear the Apostles speak the wonderful things of God in their own Language in which they were born. This was extraordinary as to the attainment, since skill in the Languages hath been attained by ordinary means in the use of study and prayer; and so by Translations People have known by reading, hearing the great Mystery of Jesus, and Salvation by him in their own Tongue; In gifts both ways, extraordinary then, upon a sudden without their study, and gifts ordinary attained by means, since God according to his Infinite Wisdom and Mercy made known his Will, his Grace for mans Salvation. So that I may say of translating the Word, what *Kentigern* a Bishop in *Wales* about the year 550, was wont to say of Preaching; *viz. They that are against Preaching Gods word, envy the Salvation of Mankind.* So they that hinder translating fill Hell.

Ulphilas translated the Bible about thirteen hundred years since into the *Gothish* Tongue; he invented the Characters; translated on purpose that the Barbarous might learn the Mysteries and Truth of God, *Ut discerent eloquia Dei.* Many, very many of the *Goths* were converted, and were Martyred by *Athanaricus*, because they forsook the Religion of their Fathers, *sc.* Paganism, they did embrace death for Christ, *Socr. Eccl. Hist. l.*4. *c.*27.

St. *Hierom* translated the Scriptures into the *Dalmatick* Tongue, *Bellarmine* and *Harding* would seem to doubt of it. *Hosius* and *Alphonsus a Castro* do both acknowledg it; and 'tis no wonder, for *Hierome* himself saith he did so, in his *Epist. ad Sophronium*, *Hominibus linguæ meæ dedi*; and when *Sophronius* desired him to translate the *Psalms* into *Latin* most accurately, because he would translate them into *Greek*, he adviseth him there was no need; and quotes that of the Poet, *In Sylvas ne ligna feras*; that is in *English*, *Carry not coals to Newcastle*, or, *cast not water into the Sea*; there were so many Translations into the *Greek* that it would be supernumerary. Ibid.

The same *Hierom* tells us that at the Burial of *Paula*, such Companies came to the Solemnities out of the Cities of *Palestine* as passed again, and that they did sing Psalms orderly, People of several Nations, *Hebræo*, *Græco*, *Syro*, *Latino Sermone*, in *Hebrew*, *Greek*, *Syriack*, and *Latin*; *ad Eustoch. de Epitap. Paulæ.*

They that have Translated the *Hebrew* into *Greek*, *Numerari possunt*, may be numbered, they were many; but they that Translated it into *Latin* are numberless, *Latini autem nullo modo:* Austin *de Doct. Christ. lib.*2. *c.*11.

Basil

Basil affirms that Translations were made into the *Palestine*, *Thebane*, *Phœnician*, *Arabick*, and *Lybian* Tongues, *in Epist. ad Neocæsar. Chrysostome* the same; *Isidore* saith into *all* Christian Tongues, *de Eccles. Offic. cap.* 10.

What should I speak of *Aquila*, *Theodotion*, *Symmachus*, *Origen*, or the *Syriack* of the New Testament, which is very ancient; some ascribe it to *Mark*, for it is so evident that *Alphonsus a Castro* doth confess it, *Fatemur sacros libros olim in linguam vulgarem fuisse translatos*, We *confess that of old time the holy Books were translated into the vulgar tongue.* I humbly conceive it is remarkable (sure I am to me it is so) that God gave to *Jeremy* what the *Jews* should say when they were in *Babylon*, not in the *Hebrew*, but in the *Chaldee* Tongue, for that Tongue the *Babylonians* spoke, and not the *Hebrew*, and so the *Babylonians* might understand what they said to them, *Jer.* 10. 11. *Thus shall ye say unto them, the Gods that have not made the Heavens and the Earth, they shall perish, &c.* 'Tis in *Chaldee* there, that is the Original. And so likewise *Daniel* expounds *Nebuchadnezzars* dream to him in the *Chaldee* Tongue, and several Chapters in him are in *Chaldee*; so that here *Chaldee* is the Original. I have mused sometimes why *Daniel* in writing the Historical part of his Book did not write it in *Hebrew*, seeing the things were past and gone before he wrote, why should he historifie those great passages in the *Chaldee* as he spoke them, and not in *Hebrew*, unless it be this, that God would have us from hence observe, That it is his will that men should know their own concerns in their own Tongue, that they themselves might read and hear: What an irrational, bloody, abominable thing then is it in the Council of *Trent* to forbid the Translating of the Scriptures on purpose to keep poor and yet immortal Souls in ignorance; there are none do thus that I know, but the *Turk*, the Grand *Mufties* at *Rome* and *Constantinople* in this are agreed. The *Turkish* Religion framed to shed much blood, (*ad fundendum sanguinem facta*) delighteth much in Rites and Ceremonies, and commands belief most imperiously without any *liberty to enquire what or why:* Unde librorum quos sanctos habent lectio plebi interdicta est, *whence it is that the People are forbid to read their (holy) Books, which very thing is a present and manifest token of iniquity.* H. G. de ver. Rel. l. 6.

But let us go a little further in this. *Eusebius* in his *Præp. Evang. l.* 13. inclines to judg that *Moses* was Translated into *Greek* before the *Persian* Monarchy. *Numenius* a *Pythagorean* Philosopher said of *Plato*, that what *Plato* wrote of God and the World, he stole it out of *Moses*, (thus when thieves fall out, *&c.*) and what is *Plato but Moses turned into good Greek?* But whether there were any Translation then, or whether they learned of the *Jews* with whom they did much and long converse, (which is the more probable way of the two,) I mean the prime Philosopher *Pythagoras*, after him nigh 190 years *Plato*, and then *Aristotle* with others, I do not determine; But sure I am (though men love to cry up

theſe and neglect *Moſes)* that they were proud puddling Plagiaries or thieves.

Ptolomy Philadelphus cauſed the *Hebrew* to be tranſlated into *Greek*, and received it with great Veneration when he heard the Law read in a Tongue he underſtood; ſee at large *Joſephus Jew. Antiq. lib.*12. *c.*1,3. other Tranſlations there were that went under the name of the *Septuagint*; this the Eunuch was reading in his Chariot, *Act.* 8. *Luke* ſets it down according as it is in the *Greek* Tranſlation, and not in the *Heb.* Original. *Philip* expounds to him, and God bleſſeth, the Eunuch believes in Jeſus, is baptized, goes on his way rejoycing, a good Argument for Tranſlation; yet that Tranſlation of that Text which the Eunuch was in reading was nothing accurate, *in his humiliation his judgment was taken away*; it is, *he was taken from priſon or reſtraint, and from judgment.* Let us now ſee a little what our Adverſaries do object againſt us in this caſe. Firſt they ſay,

Obj. *This Iſland hath continued in the Faith this* 1300 *years without Bibles till of late.*

Anſ. Very falſe, *Conſtantine* commanded the Bible to be written and ſent abroad into all Countrys, Kingdoms, Nations of his Dominions; whereof *England*, or rather *Britain* was one. *Adelſtane* King of *England* cauſed the Bible to be Tranſlated into the *Engliſh* Tongue. *Beda* almoſt a thouſand years ſince Tranſlated the Goſpel of St. *John* into *Engliſh.* Biſhop *Jewel*, *John Treviſa*, *Fuller*, *C. H. Beda* ſaith, *Five Nations did converſe with one Truth*, *one Bible*, *Britons*, *Engliſh*, *Picts*, *Scots*, *Latins. Hæc Inſula quinque gentium linguis unam eandemque ſcrutatur veritatis ſcientiam*, Bed. lib.1. Eccleſ. Hiſt. *Cedman* Tranſlated the Hiſtory of the Creation, the Departure from *Egypt*, the Entrance into *Canaan*, the Birth, Death, Reſurrection and Aſcenſion of Chriſt, the Glory of Heaven, the Pains of Hell: *De Doctrina Apoſtolorum, de terrore futuri Judicii, de aliis plurimis Scripturæ Hiſtoriis; multorum animi ad contemptum ſæculi & ad appetitum vitæ cœleſtis accenſi fuere*, Bed. *Eccleſ. Hiſt.* (according to mine,) *lib.*4. *c.* 24. many men were mortified and made heavenly thereby, by *Cedmans* Tranſlation. Suppoſe they had none, what then, ſhould they never have? time was they were Gentiles and Pagans, ſhould they continue ſo?

Obj. 2. *Your Tranſlations are faulty*, Harding, Rhemiſts.

Anſw. This is ſaid a thouſand times but never proved, an untruth joyned with ſlander, ſo *Jewel*; a ſpiteful lie, ſo *Cartwright* anſwers the Jeſuits; Shew them (ſaith he). Dr. *Martin* did attempt it, but was laught at for his folly by his friend: The words may be ſhort, but the ſenſe is incorrupt.

Obj. 3. *What, the Scripture Tranſlated into a Barbarous Tongue!*

Anſ. This makes a noiſe, Barbarous, barbarous, Vulgar Tongues, for Hoſtlers, Tapſters, Sempſters, idle, looſe, ſenſual, brutal men, this is their Rhetorick; but indeed it is a very rancorous, croaking noiſe;

Barbara

Barbara lingua eſt quæ neſcit laudare Dominum, Bed. The Bible in any Language is holy, and the Language is holy that knows how to worſhip God, and bleſs Jeſus. What were the *Canaanites*? what was *Terah*, *Nahor*, *Abraham*, before God called him? When *Abraham* came into *Canaan* was not the *Hebrew* the Language of Heathens? was not the *Greek* a Pagan Tongue? *If I know not the meaning of the voice I ſhall be a Barbarian to him, and he to me*, 1 Cor. 14. 11. *Paul* calls every Tongue barbarous that is not underſtood, and ſo all the Prayers of the Papiſts are barbarous, becauſe they are not underſtood by the People.

To conclude, they allow no Tranſlation but the old *Latin*, this the Council makes authentical, prefers above the Original; it hath been mended ſeveral times, but yet crawls with many very great faults, againſt their knowledg on purpoſe to defend their Errors and Idolatries. I refer to *Chemnit. Exam. 1 part. de Scr.* Our learned Biſhop *Mortons* Appeal, *Lib.* 4. *c.* 18. *Sect.* 3. there it may be found.

Take an Inſtance or two in *Gen.* 3. 15. *He ſhall bruiſe the Serpents head*; ſo the *Hebrew*, ſo the Seventy Tranſlate it. So the learned Papiſts do acknowledg it. Yet in the laſt Edition ſet forth by *Clement* the Eighth, the vulgar *Latin* read it, *She*; *ſc.* the Virgin *Mary*, *She ſhall break the Serpents head.* And this though it be a manifeſt, nay a confeſſed corruption of the Text, yet is ſtill reſerved by them, and no man in Writing, Preaching, Diſputing, muſt dare to uſe any other but this; and this they do againſt knowledg, on purpoſe to keep up their blaſphemous, Idolatrous Worſhip: Here is their Reformation.

So in *Exod.* 34. 29, 30. they read thus, *They ſaw his face horned:* Heb. *ſhining*, as we read it; hereupon they picture *Moſes* with a pair of Horns, for which the *Jews* do horribly curſe the Chriſtians, as though they thought *Moſes* to be a Devil.

So *Heb.* 11. 21. they read it, *Jacob worſhipped the top of his rod*; *adoravit faſtigium virgæ*; whereas in the *Greek* it is, *He worſhipped upon his ſtaff, at or upon his ſtaff.* And this is confeſſed by their own men, *Græce ſuper faſtigium*; *ſc. nixus baculo ejus*; Sa. Jeſ. *in loc.* Though our Tranſlators dealt honeſtly, putting *leaning* in a different Character, becauſe it is not in the *Greek*. How do they cry out of Falſities! no man can think what a ſtir the Image-mongers make for their Idolatry by this corrupt Tranſlation of their Vulgar, that *Jacob worſhipped his ſtaff*; they catch at any ſorry thing for advantage. So in their own Annotations upon *Mat.* 2. the Wiſemen that came from the Eaſt, they impudently and fooliſhly call them the *three Kings of Colen*; and how their Bodies were tranſlated thither on purpoſe to keep the old trade of Pilgrimage and Prayers for the ſake of Offerings; they durſt not let the Bible go abroad without a keeper, their frothy fooliſh falſe Notes.

Well, let us ſeriouſly conſider what a rich mercy we have that we have it in liberty, purity, ſafety in our Mother-tongue. How do *Hierom*, *Auſtin*, and the reſt of the Fathers, *Luther*, *Calvin*, and our own Re-

formers ſtrain for Expreſſions to ſet forth their Excellency, let us not be dull and ſtupid; let us abhor Popery that will maintain their Kingdom of Darkneſs, though it be in darkneſs of *Souls*, the ready way to *everlaſting* darkneſs.

Let us pray frequently for the life and ſafety of him that is Supream, and thoſe that are ſubordinate under him; Aſſure your ſelves theſe are matters of near concernment.

Let us pray that God would blaſt Popery, that God would preſerve us from it; if that ſhould for our Goſpel-ſins prevail, you muſt loſe your Bibles, perhaps your Bodies too, unleſs you will adventure to loſe the Truth, and your Souls: aſſure your ſelves they have waded through the blood of men to deſtroy the Word of God, and will do ſo ſtill; their ſtrongeſt arguments are Swords and Stakes.

Laſtly, by Hearing, Reading, Praying, Meditation, let every one of us labour to be expert in the Word, *Apollos* was mighty in the Scriptures. To ſtir up your hearts, conſider theſe Particulars: 1. The Author; it is infinitely the beſt, the moſt holy, only wiſe God; 1 *Tim.* 3. v. *laſt.* 2 *Pet.* 1. v. *laſt.* it is ſeven times repeated in the ſeven Epiſtles, *Rev.* 2. 3. *ch.* what the Spirit, the Spirit of Glory, of Holineſs, the Spirit of Truth ſaith to the Churches. 2. The matter; it is our Lord Jeſus: here are the treaſures, all treaſures, of Wiſdom, Divine Wiſdom and Knowledg; here are the Commands of God, full, plain, pure, everlaſting; here are the Promiſes exceeding great, free, precious Promiſes, Yea and Amen in Chriſt; here are the Works of Gods Creation and Providence, which the Philoſophers knew not. 3. The Office of it, it is to inſtruct, to give underſtanding, to convince of Sin, of Hell, of Jeſus, 'tis to breed and encreaſe Holineſs, Peace of Conſcience. Laſtly the end, to make us wiſe unto Salvation, through Faith in Chriſt Jeſus;

SERMON

SERMON VI.

Dr. Thomas Manton

PROPOSITION.

The Scripture is a sufficient Rule of Christian Faith, or a Record of all necessary Christian Doctrines, without any supplement of unwritten Traditions, as containing any necessary matter of Faith, and is thus far sufficient for the decision of all Controversies.

---

2 Thes. 2. 15. *Therefore Brethren stand fast and hold the Traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our Epistle.*

THE Apostle after he had *comforted* the *Thessalonians*, he *exhorteth* them to Constancy in the Truth, whatever Temptations they had to the contrary. The *Comforts* he propoundeth to them were taken, 1. From their *Election*, ver. 13. 2*ly*. From their *Vocation*, ver. 14. His *Exhortation* is to Perseverance: *Therefore, Brethren, &c.*

In the words observe, 1. The Illative particle [*Therefore*] because God hath *chosen* you and *called* you, and given you such advantages against Error and Seduction.

2. The Duty inferred, στήκετε, *stand fast*; it is a Military word, you have the same in other places, 1 *Cor.* 16. 13. *Watch ye, stand ye fast, &c.* *Ephes.* 6. 14. *Stand therefore, having your loyns girt about with truth.* The word intimateth Perseverance.

3. The

3. The means of Perseverance, *Hold the Traditions which you have been taught, whether by word or our Epistle.*

Where observe, 1. The *Act*; 2. The *Object.*

1. The *Act*, κρατεῖτε, *hold* with strong hand; the word implieth a a forcible holding against assaults, whether of *Error* or *Persecution.* The *Thessalonians* were assaulted in both kinds; the Heathens persecuted them, and some were gone abroad that began the *Mystery of Iniquity*, and were ready to pervert them.

2. The *Object*; which is propounded, 1. By a common and general term, the *Traditions which you have been taught.* 2. By a Distribution, *Whether by word or our* Epistle.

I. The common and general term, [*the Traditions which ye have been taught,*] there are two sorts of Traditions, *Humane* and *Divine.*

1. Humane Traditions are certain External Observances instituted by men, and delivered from hand to hand, from Progenitours to their Posterity; these may be either *besides* or *contrary* to the Word of God: 1. *Beside* the Word; as the Institutions of the Family of the *Rechabites*, in the observance of which from Father to Son, they were so exact and punctual, that God produceth their Example to shame the disobedience of his People, *Jer.* 35. 6,7. *Jonadab the Son of Rechab our Father commanded us saying, Ye shall drink no wine, nor build houses, nor plant Vineyards, &c.* 2. *Contrary* to the Word of God; such as were those of the Pharisees, *Mat.*15.2. *Why transgress ye the Commandment of God by your Tradition?* Humane inventions in Religion are contrary to and destructive of Divine Laws.

2. *Traditions Divine* are either Heavenly Doctrins revealed by God, or Institutions and Ordinances appointed by him for the use of the Church. These are the Rule and Ground of our *Faith, Worship* and *Obedience.* The whole Doctrine of the Gospel is a *Tradition* delivered and conveyed to us by fit Messengers, such as the Apostles were; 1 *Cor.* 11. 2. *Now I praise you Brethren, that ye remember me in all things, and keep the Ordinances*, Marg. *Traditions, as I delivered them to you.* So that *holding the Traditions* is nothing else but Perseverance in Apostolical Doctrine.

II. The *Distribution*; That no cheats might be put upon them under any pretence; therefore, he saith, *Whether by word, or our Epistle*; that is, by *word of mouth* when present, or *by Epistle* when absent. And he saith, not *Epistles*, but *Epistle*; as alluding to the former wrote unto them: They were bound to yield to both alike credence and obedience; for whether in *speaking* or *writing*, the Apostolical Authority was the same. To improve this Verse for your benefit, I shall lay down several Propositions.

1. *That whatever assurance we have of Gods preserving us in the truth, yet we are bound to use diligence and caution*; for the Apostle had said, That God had *chosen* and *called* them to the *belief of the truth*; and yet saith, *Therefore Brethren stand fast.* First, Reason will tell us. That when we intend

intend *an End* we must use *the Means*, otherwise the *bare intention* and desire would suffice, and to the accomplishing of any effect, we need no more than to will it; and then the sluggard would be the wisest man in the world; who is full of Wishings and Wouldings, though his hands refuse to labour; But common experience sheweth that the End cannot be obtained without a diligent use of the means, *Prov.* 13.4. *The soul of the sluggard desireth and hath nothing, but the soul of the diligent shall be made fat*; that is, rewarded with the intended benefit.

2. The business in hand is, Whether Gods Election, Calling, or Promise doth so secure the End to us, as that we need not be so careful in the diligent use of Means. Such a notion or conceit there may be in the hearts of men, therefore let us attack it a little by these Considerations.

1. Gods Decree is both of *Ends* and *Means*; for all his Purposes are executed by fit means. He that *hath chosen us to Salvation*, bringeth it about by the *belief of the Truth and Sanctification of the Spirit*, 2 Thes. 2. 13. And without Faith and Holiness no man shall see God, and escape condemnation. God had assured *Paul*, *That there should be no loss of any mans life among them except of the Ship*, Act. 27. 22. And yet afterward *vers.* 31. *Paul* telleth them, *Except these abide in the Ship ye cannot be saved.* How could that Assurance given to *Paul* from God, and *Pauls* Caution to the Mariners stand together? Doth the purpose of God depend upon the uncertain will and actions of men? I answer not as *a cause*, from whence it receiveth its force and strength, but as *a means* appointed also by God to the execution of his Decree; for by the same Decree God appointeth the event what he will do, and the means by which he will have it to be done; and the Lord revealing by his Word this conjunction of Ends and Means, there is a necessity of Duty lying upon man to use these Means and not to expect the End without them. God intended to save all in the Ship, and yet the Mariners must abide in the Ship; therefore what God hath joined together let no man separate: If we separate these things God doth not change his Counsel, but we pervert his order to our own destruction.

2*ly*. God that hath bidden us to *believe his Promises*, hath forbidden us to *tempt his Providence*, Mat. 4. 7. Now we *tempt God*, when we desire him to give an extraordinary proof of his care over us, when ordinary Means will serve the turn, or be useful to us.

3*ly*. Though the Means seem to have no connexion with the End; yet if God hath injoined them for that End, we must use them. As in the instance of *Naaman*, God was resolved to cure him; but *Naaman* must take his prescribed way, though against his own fancy and conceit, 2 *King.* 5. 10. *Wash in Jordan seven times, and thy flesh shall come again unto thee, and thou shalt be clean.* Compare *vers.* 13. *If the Prophet had bidden thee to do some greater thing, &c.* So *Joh.* 13. 6, 7. *Peter* must submit to be *washed*, though he could not see the *benefit* of it. So

Joh.

Joh. 9. 6, 7. the blind man must submit to have his *eyes anointed with clay*, and *wash in the Pool of Siloam*; though the Clay seemed to put out his eyes rather than cure them; and the Pool could not wash away his blindness; but Means appointed by God must be used, whatever improbabilities are apprehended by us.

4. That when Gods Will is expresly declared concerning the Event, yet he will have the Means used; as for instance, 2 *King.* 20. 5, 6, 7. God was absolutely resolved to add *fifteen years* more to *Hezekiahs* life, yet he must take a *lump of Figs and lay it on the boil:* Which plainly sheweth that no *promise* on Gods part, nor *assurance* on ours hindreth the use of Means, God will work by them, not without them.

5. In Spiritual things Assurance of the Event is an *encouragement to industry*, not a *pretence to sloth*, 1 Joh. 2. 27, 28. *Yea shall abide in him*; and now, *Little children abide in him.* The promise of Perseverance doth incourage us to use endeavours that we may persevere, and *quicken diligence* rather than *nourish security*, or open a gap to *carnal liberty*, 1 Cor. 9. 26. *I run not as one that is uncertain*; we are the more earnest, because we are assured the Means shall not be uneffectual.

2. Prop: *Our duty is to stand fast in the Faith of Christ, and profession of Godliness, whatever Temptations we have to the contrary.* [Stand fast] being a Military word, it alludeth to a Soldiers keeping his ground; and is opposed to two things, 1. *A cowardly flight*; 2. *A treacherous revolt.*

1. *A cowardly flight*, implieth our being overcome in *the evil-day*, by the many afflictions that befal us for the Truths sake, *Ephes.* 6. 13. *Wherefore take to you the whole armor of God, that you may be able to withstand in the evil-day, that after you have done all things ye may stand.* Their Temptation was the many troubles and persecutions that befal them, called there *the evil day.* Their defence lay in the *whole armor of God*, which is there made of six pieces, *the Girdle of Truth* or *Sincerity*, which is a strength to us as a girdle to the loyns; the *breast-plate of Righteousness*, or an holy inclination and desire to perform our Duty to God in all things; and the *Shield of Faith*, or a stedfast adhering to the Truths of the Gospel, whether delivered in a way of command, promise or threatning; the *Helmet of Hope*, or a certain and delirous expectation of the promised Glory, *the shoo of the preparation of the Gospel of peace*, which is a headiness to endure all Encounters for Christs sake, who hath made our Peace with God; and the *Sword of the Spirit which is the Word of God*: Now if we take this armor and use it in our Conflicts, what doth it serve for? to *withstand* and *stand*; the first is the act of *a Soldier*, the second is the posture of a *Conqueror*; here is *withstanding* till the Field be won, and then *standing* when the day of evil is over. Here we make our way to heaven by conflict and conquest, and hereafter we triumph.

2. *A*

2. *A treacherous revolt*, or yielding to the enemy by complying with those things which are against the Interest of Christ and his Kingdom for advantage sake, 2 *Tim.* 4. 10. *Demas hath forsaken us and loved the present world.* Backsliders *in heart* are the worst sort of Apostates, such as lose their affection to God, and delight in his ways, and esteem of his glorious recompences, for a little pleasure, profit, or pomp of living; *Sell the birth-right for one morsel of meat*, Heb. 12. 15, 16. Some fail in their *understandings*, but most miscarry by the perverse inclination of their *wills*; they are carnal, worldly Hypocrites that never thoroughly mortified the fleshly mind; prize things as they are commodious to the flesh, and will save them from sufferings. The byas of such mens hearts doth easily prevail against the light of their understandings.

3. Prop. *The means of standing fast is by holding the Traditions which were taught by the holy Apostles.* Here I will prove, 1. That the Doctrine of Christianity taught by the Apostles is a Tradition. 2. That holding this Tradition by strong hand, when others *would* wrest it from us, is the means of our Perseverance.

1. *That the Doctrine of Christianity is a Tradition.* I prove it by two Arguments; first, Matters not evident by the *light of nature*, nor immediately revealed to us by God must be either *an Invention* or *a Tradition*; an *Invention* is something in Religion not evident by natural light, nor agreeable to sound reason, but is some cunningly *devised fable*, invented by one or more, and obtruded by various artifices upon the Belief of the World. Inventions in this kind were mans *disease*, not his *remedy*, *Eccles.* 7. 29. *God made man upright but they sought out many Inventions.* As when the Philosophers sat abrood upon Religion, a goodly *Chymæra* it was they hatched and brought forth! *Rom.* 1. 21, 22. *They became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened, and professing themselves to be wise they became fools.* These Inventions little became *the nature of God.* Nor were they *profitable to man*, for still the great sore of nature was unhealed which is a *fear of death*, and the righteous wrath of God, *Rom.* 1. 32. so that neither mans *comfort* nor *duty* was well provided for: surely the Gospel is none of this sort; not an *Invention of man*, but a *Revelation of God*; and a Revelation not made to *us in person*, but brought out of *the bosom of God* by Jesus Christ, and by him manifested to chosen witnesses, who might publish this Mystery and Secret to others. Well then, since the Gospel is not an *Invention*, it is a *Tradition*, or a delivery of the Truth upon the Testimony of one that came from God to instruct the World, or reduce it to him; not an Invention of man, but a Secret brought out of the bosom of God, by our Lord Jesus Christ: Therefore 'tis said, *Heb.* 2. 3, 4. *How shall we escape if we neglect so great Salvation; first spoken by the Lord himself, and then confirmed to us by them that heard him, the Lord bearing*

them witness, &c. Christ delivered it to the Apostles, and the Apostles delivered it to others, 2 *Tim.* 2. 2. *Those things which thou hast heard from me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also.* The Apostles received the Gospel from Christ, and the Churches, and Ministers from the Apostles, and then delivered it down to others until it came to us; which is the means of our believing the Truth, and confessing the Name of Christ. This Testimony delivered and conveyed to us by the most credible Means, and which we have no reason to doubt of, is as binding as if we had heard Christ and his Apostles in person: for we have their *word* in *writing*, though we did not hear them preach and publish it with the lively voice; their Authority is the same delivered either way. And that these are their Writings, appeareth by the *constant Tradition* of the Church, and the acknowledgment of *Friends* and *Enemies*, who still appeal to them as a *publick authentick Record*, and as they have been attested *by the Church*, they have been owned *by God*, and blessed by him to the converting and sanctifying of many Souls, throughout all successions of Ages: And by this Tradition Christianity hath held up the head against all encounters of time, and the *persecutions* of adverse Powers have not suppressed it; nor the disputes of enemies silenced the profession of it: But from age to age it hath been received and transmitted to future Generations, though sometimes at a very dear rate. And this is binding to us though we saw not the Persons and Miracles by which they confirmed their Message, and heard not the first report. Yet the *Universal Tradition* having handed it to us is a sufficient ground of Faith; and so *we believe through their word*, and are concerned in Christs Prayers, *Joh.* 17. 20. for with them and their Successors (as to these necessary things) Christ hath promised to be to the *end of the world*, Mat. 28. 20.

2*ly.* My next Argument is; Because Christian Religion must needs be a Tradition, partly because *matter of fact* is the foundation of it, and it is in it self *matter of faith*: 1. Because it is built upon *matter of fact*; that the Son of God came from God to bring us to God; that is to say, appeared in *Humane nature*, instructed the World by his *Doctrine* and *Example*, and at length *died for sinners*, confirming both in *life* and *death* the truth of *his Mission*, by such unquestionable Miracles as shewed him to be the *Son of God*, and the *Saviour of the World*. Now a Testimony, Tradition, or Report is necessary in *matters of fact*, which of necessity must be confined to some determinate *time* and *place*. It was not fit that Christ should be always working Miracles, always dying, always rising and ascending, in every place, and in the view of every man; but these things were to be once done in one place of the World, in the sight of some particular and competent Witnesses: But because the knowledg of them concerned all the rest of the World, they were by them to be attested to others; *matters of fact* can only be proved

ved by *credible witneſſes*, and this was the great Office put upon the Apoſtles, *Act.* 1. 8.21,22. and *Act.*2.32. *Act.*3.15. *Act.* 10. 39,40,41. 2. As it is *matter of Fact*; or the Doctrine built upon this *matter of Fact.* We cannot properly be ſaid to believe a thing but upon report and teſtimony: I may *know* a thing by *ſenſe* or *reaſon*, but I cannot *believe* it but as it is affirmed or brought to me by credible Teſtimony. As we are ſaid *to ſee* thoſe things which we perceive by the eye, or the ſenſe of ſeeing, and to *know* thoſe things which we receive by *reaſon*, or *ſure demonſtration*; ſo we are ſaid to *believe* thoſe things which are brought to us by *valuable teſtimony*, *tradition*, and *report.* As for inſtance if any one ask you, Do you believe the Sun ſhineth at Noonday? You will anſwer, I do not *believe* it but *ſee* it: So if any one ask you, Do you believe that twice two make four, and twice three make ſix? You will ſay I do not *believe* it but *know* it, becauſe certain and evident reaſon telleth me, that two is the half of four, and three of ſix, and every whole conſiſteth of two halfs or moyeties: But if he ſhould ask you, Do you believe that the Sun is bigger than the Earth? You will ſay *I believe it*; for though your Eye doth not diſcover it, nor doth an ignorant man know any certain demonſtration of it; yet having the authority of learned men, who are competent judges in the caſe, you judg it a raſh and fooliſh obſtinacy not to believe it. Apply it now to *the myſteries of Godlineſs* revealed in the Goſpel, they cannot be ſeen with the Eye, for they are inviſible; nor found out and comprehended by any Humane Underſtanding, becauſe they exceed the reach of mans Reaſon, and depend upon *the love* and arbitrary will of God, *Joh.* 3. 16. Yet you believe them, becauſe God hath revealed them to the *Prophets* and *Apoſtles*; and God being Truth and Wiſdom it ſelf, cannot deceive, or be deceived; and therefore you believe them with the certainty of Divine Faith, and do no more doubt of them than you do of thoſe things which you ſee with your eyes, and know and underſtand by a ſure Demonſtration. The ſenſe of ſeeing may be deceived, and Humane Reaſon may err; but 'tis impoſſible God ſhould deceive or be deceived. It often-times falleth out that men do prefer the authority and report of a man whom they judg to be wiſe and good before their own ſenſe and reaſon; as for inſtance, that man who by his eye judgeth the Sun to be leſs than the Earth, yet doth not obſtinately ſtand in his opinion, when he heareth a knowing and skilful Philoſopher aſſert the contrary; *Now if we receive the witneſs of men the witneſs of God is greater*, 1 Joh. 5. 9. And this Teſtimony of God is brought to us by his authorized Meſſengers as the *ground of Faith*; and what is that but Tradition. We believe in God by hearing of him, and we *hear by a Preacher*, Rom. 10.14. Ordinary Preachers *declare* his mind to us, but the Extraordinary *confirm* it; the common Preachers give us *notice*, but *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles* give us *aſſurance*; and by their Teſtimony and Tradition our Faith is *ultimately reſolved* into the *Veracity* of God.

2*ly*. That holding this Tradition is the great means of ſtanding faſt in the Faith of Chriſt, and the Confeſſion of his Name. For in the Word of God delivered by Chriſt and his Apoſtles, there *is ſure direction* to walk by; *and ſure promiſes* to build upon. For whatever they made known of Chriſt was *not a fable*, but a *certain truth*; for they had the teſtimony of Senſe, 2 *Pet.* 1. 16, 17. 1 *Joh.* 1. 1, 2, 3, 4. and ſo could plead both the *authority of his command*, and *the certainty of his Promiſe*, and that with *uncontroulable evidence*; and without this Revelation there can be neither *Faith* nor *Obedience*, nor *ſure expectation* of Happineſs. For we cannot *truſt* God for what he hath not promiſed, nor *obey* God in what he hath not commanded; nor in our difficulties and diſtreſſes *expect* happineſs from him without his warrant and aſſurance. But by this Doctrine delivered to us we have all that belongeth to *Faith*, *Obedience* and *Happineſs*; and beyond that the Creature can deſire no more. 1. There can be no Faith till we have a ſure Teſtimony of Gods Revelation; for *Faith is a believing ſuch things as God hath revealed, becauſe he hath revealed them.* 'Tis not *Faith* but *fancy*, to believe ſuch things as God hath never revealed; nor is it *Truſt* and a *regular Confidence* to think, that he will certainly give us what he hath never promiſed; this were to lay us open to all manner of deluſion: And therefore we are never upon ſure and ſtable ground, but by ſticking to *ſuch a Tradition* as may juſtly intitle it ſelf to God. 2. Nor *Obedience*; for Obedience is a *doing what God hath commanded becauſe he hath commanded it.* The fundamental reaſon of Obedience is the ſight *of Gods will*, 1 Theſ. 4. 3. 1 *Theſ.* 5. 18. 1 *Pet.* 2. 15. To do what God never commanded, or not to do it upon that account but for other reaſons is not Obedience; and in difficult caſes the Soul can never be held to its duty, till we are perſwaded that ſo is Gods Will concerning us. Now to know his Will concerning us, we are often bidden *to ſearch the Scriptures*; but never bidden to conſult with the Church to know what *unwritten Traditions* ſhe hath in her keeping to inſtruct us in our Duty. 3. No *certain expectation of Happineſs.* We are never ſafe till we know by what Rule Chriſt will *judg us*, that is, *reward* or *puniſh* men at the laſt day: Now he will judg us according to the Goſpel; *Rom.* 2. 16. 1 *Theſ.* 1. 8. Obey the Goſpel, and you have a perfect Rule to guide you to Happineſs; but if you neglect *this great Salvation*, or be unfaithful in the profeſſion of it, this Word condemneth you, and God will ratifie the ſentence of it.

4. Prop. *That whileſt the Apoſtles were in being, there were two ways of delivering the Truth, and that is by word of mouth and writing.* So in the Text, *Whether by word, or our Epiſtle.* The Apoſtles went up and down and preached Chriſt every-where; that needeth no proof, unleſs you would have me to produce the whole Book of the *Acts of the Apoſtles:* But they did not *preach* only but *write*, and both by the inſtinct of the

the holy Spirit, who guided their *Journies*, and moved them to *write Epistles*: For being often absent from Churches newly planted, and Heresies arising, or some Contentions, which could not be avoided among weak Christians, God over-ruled these *Occasions* for the profit of the Church in after-Ages. Upon one occasion or another they saw a necessity to write ἀνάγκην ἔχων, *Jude* 3. *It was needful for me to write unto you.* As in the Old Testament God himself delivered the *Law* with great Majesty and terrour, and afterward caused the same to be written in Tables of Stone for the constant use of his People. And the Prophets first *uttered* their Prophecies, and then *wrote* them: So the Apostles first *preached* Evangelical Doctrine, and then consigned it to *writing* for the use of all Ages. And though all things delivered by them were not delivered in *one Sermon*, or *one Epistle*; yet by degrees the Canon of the New Testament was constituted and made perfect by the Writings of the *Evangelists* and *Apostles*.

5. Prop: *That now when they are long since gone to God, and we cannot receive from them the Doctrine of Life by word of mouth, we must stick to the Scriptures or written word.* 1. Because we are taught to do so by *Christ* and his *Apostles*. Christ always appealeth to the Writings of the Old Testament, both against *Traditions*, which he condemneth, *Mat.* 15. 2. and against *pretended Revelations*, Luk. 16. 31. *If they hear not Moses and the Prophets, neither will they be perswaded to repent, if one should come from the dead.* And the Apostles still have recourse to this proof, *Act.* 26. 22. *Witnessing no other things than the Prophets and Moses did say should come to pass:* And when they pleaded they were eye and ear-witnesses, and so their Testimony was valuable; yet they say ye have βεβαιότερον λογον, *a surer word of Prophesie whereunto ye shall do well to take heed*, 2 Pet. 1. 19. Now how can we do better than to imitate these great Examples? 2. Because these things were written for our sakes, 1 *Joh.* 1. 4. *These things write we unto you, that your joy may be full.* The Apostles being to leave the World, did know the *slipperiness* of mans memory, and the danger of *corrupting* Christian Doctrine, if there were not a sure Authentick Record left; Therefore they wrote, and so fully, that nothing is wanting to compleat our joy and happiness. 3. Because the Scriptures *are perfect*. The perfection of Scripture is known by *its end*, and intended *use*; which is to give us a knowledg of those things which concern our *Faith*, *Duty* and *Happiness*. 1. Our *Faith in Christ*. If there be enough written for that end, we need not unwritten Traditions to compleat our Rule: Now St. *John* telleth us he might have written more things, *But these things are written that ye might believe in the Son of God, and have life through his name*, Joh. 20. 30, 31. Certainly nothing is wanting to beget a Faith in Christ; the *Object* is sufficiently propounded, the *Warrant* or *Claim* is laid down in the New Covenant, and the *Incouragements* to believe are *clear* and *strong*.

strong. What would men have more? so that here is a perfect Rule, perfect in *its kind*, and for its *proper use*. 2. For our Duty; that is sufficiently provided for. The Apostle telleth us, That *the Grace of God*, take it *Objectively* for the Grace of the Gospel, or *Subjectively* for Grace in our hearts, *teacheth us*: if you mean *Objective Grace*, it *prescribeth*, *directeth*; if of *Subjective Grace*, it perswadeth and exciteth what to do, *to live soberly*, *righteously*, *godly*, *in the present world*, Tit. 2. 12. There are all the Branches of Mans Duty enumerated: *Sobriety* relateth to self-government; *Righteously* to our carriage towards our Neighbour; *Godly* to our commerce and communion with God. Now in the Word of God what is there wanting, that belongeth either to Worship, or Justice, or personal Holiness? therefore certainly we need no other Rule; for it layeth down whatsoever Men are bound to do in all Ages and Places of the World, and in whatsoever circumstances God shall put them: And so it is fit to be the Law of the *Universal King* and *Lawgiver*; yea it is so perfect, that whatever other way is set up, it presently dasheth against those notions that we have or should have of God and his Service, and Worship; or it *infringeth* or *perverteth* the *liberty* and *nature* of man. 3. For our Happiness; that Doctrine and Institution, which is able to make us *wise unto Salvation*, is enough for us, but so the holy Scriptures are said to do, 2 *Tim.* 3. 15. *Thou hast known the holy Scriptures which are able to make thee wise unto Salvation, through the faith which is in Christ Jesus.* Nay afterward, *vers.* 17. *The man of God is by them made perfect, and thoroughly furnished to every good work.*

If the Scriptures do thoroughly direct Men to know God in Christ, and save their own Souls, why should we look any further? Now they do not only furnish every private Christian with this knowledg; but the *man of God*, who is to instruct others, he needeth look no further, but is furnished out of the Scripture with all things necessary to discharge his Office. Therefore here we fix and rest, we have a sufficient Rule, and a full Record of all necessary Christian Doctrines.

Use 1. The Use of all is; Let us not seek another Rule than the Word of God. Papists cry up Unwritten Traditions to be received with *equal respect* and *reverence*, as we receive the holy Scriptures; but you Brethren, *stand fast*, holding the Apostolical Tradition: you cannot have it by word of mouth from them now; therefore you must stick to what is written, or else you cannot preserve your selves from the frauds and impostures of Antichrist. These Apostolical Writings have been received in all ages and times of the Church from the beginning; and *all Disputes* among Christians have been tried by them: None were allowed good or sincere Christians who doubted of the truth of them. But because we have to do with a People that will sacrifice all to the honour and interest of their Church; and knowing they are not able to stand before the light of Scriptures, have to the no little preju-

dice

dice of the Christian Cause done all that they can to weaken the *Authority*, *Sufficiency* and *Perspicuity* of them, that we might have no Religion without the Testimony and Recommendation of their Church; therefore I shall resume the matter and declare it afresh.

1. Mankind lying in darkness, and in the shadow of death, it was necessary that one way or another God should reveal his mind to them, that we may know what belongeth to our *Duty* and *Happiness*, for our *chief good* and *last end*. Being altered by sin, we strangely mistake things, and put *light* for *darkness*, and *darkness* for *light*, *good* for *evil*, and *evil* for *good*; weighing all things in the ballance of the flesh which we seek to please. We confound both the *names* and *natures* of things, and wander in a maze of a thousand perplexities; therefore God in pity to Mankind hath given us a sure direction in his Word, *which is a lamp unto our feet, and a light unto our paths*, Psal. 119. 105. Mark the words of *Light* and *Lamp*; the use of a *Lamp* is by night, and in the day we have the *Light* of the Sun; whether it be *day* or *night* with us, here we are taught how to carry our selves. Mark again the words of *Path* and *Feet*, the one signifieth our *way* and general course, the other all our *particular actions*; so far as Religion is concerned in them, we have directions in the Word about them. Besides Mans condition is such that he needeth a *Supernatural Remedy* by a Redeemer, which depending upon the meer Love and free Grace of God cannot be found out by *Natural light* left to us; for that only can judg of things necessary, but not of such things as depend upon the meer pleasure of God: Therefore a Divine Revelation there must be.

2. Since it is necessary that God should some way or another reveal his mind to his People; it must be done by *Oracles*, *Visions*, *Dreams*, or by *extraordinary Messengers*, who by word of mouth might convey it to us; or else by *writing*, and by *ordinary teachers*, whose *lips may preserve knowledg* in the Church. The former ways might suffice, while God saw fit to reveal but a few Truths, and such as did not burden the Memory; and men were long-lived and of great simplicity, and the Church was confined within a small compass of ground, and not liable to so many miseries and changes as now in the latter ages: But when once God had spoken to us by his Son, these extraordinary ways ceased, *Heb.* 1. 1, 2. *God who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the Fathers by the Prophets, hath in these last times spoken unto us by his Son.* As formerly God did speak πολυτρόπως, in divers manners, that is to say, by Visions, Oracles, Dreams, &c. so πολυμερῶς, at sundry times, by several steps & degrees he acquainted the World with the Truths necessary for man to know; delivering them out *by portions*, not all together at once, till he *came who had the Spirit without measure*, Joh. 3. 34. the Prophets to whom God revealed himself before by Visions, Oracles, Dreams, or the Coming of the Spirit upon them had the Spirit ἐκ μέτρου, by *measure*, to fit them for some *particular errand* or message, on which God sent

sent them. But when God sent his Son out of his bosom to reveal the whole Doctrine of Faith *at once*, and to declare his Fathers Will with *full authority* and *power*, he fixed and closed up the Rule of Faith. So 'twas not fit that after him there should come any *Extraordinary Nuntio's* and *Embassadours* from Heaven, or any other should be owned as *Infallible Messengers*; but such as he immediately sent abroad in the World to Disciple the Nations: Therefore all former extraordinary Ways ceased, and we are left to the ordinary Rule stated by Christ.

3. Being left to the ordinary Rule it was necessary it should be taught not only by word of mouth, but committed to writing; for Christ is ascended into Heaven, and the Apostles do not live for ever: And we have no men now that are immediately and divinely inspired; and ordinary Pastors and Teachers cannot make new Articles of Faith, but do only build on the *Apostles foundation*, 1 Cor. 3. 10. or that *divinely inspired Doctrine* which they delivered to the Church. Yea, that Doctrine cannot well be preserved from *oblivion* and *corruption* without Writing, therefore God accounted this the safest way. Those things that are only delivered by word of mouth, or from hand to hand, may easily be *changed*, *corrupted*, *or utterly lost*. Certainly if you consider mans *sloth*, *treachery*, *levity*, and the many *vile affections* which may easily induce him to *extinguish* or *corrupt* the Truth which is contrary to them; you will see that it is necessary that there should be a sure *Authentick Record*, by which *Truth* and *Error* might be tried and distinguished. Yea, that the *Church* which is dispersed throughout the World might have *truth at hand*, and *particular Believers* have this Doctrine ever by them for their *comfort* and *use*; it being the property of a blessed man *to delight in the Law of God, and to exercise himself therein day and night*, *Psal.* 1. 2. In short, while the Apostles were living 'twas good to take the Tradition from *their mouth*; but now they are dead, we take it from *their Writings*. Surely if God saw some Writing necessary when those extraordinary ways (we spake of before) were in use, and the Church of the Old Testament was in a much quieter state than the Church of the New. I say, if some Writing were necessary then, it is more necessary now; for the Christian Church is more exposed to dreadful storms *of persecution*, the *deceits of Heretick*s of all sorts, especially to *the frauds of Antichrist*, which we are forewarned of in this Chapter; and are detected and discovered by their contrariety to the *written word*.

4. This Truth being written, it is both *a safe* and *a full Rule* for us to walk by; it is a *safe Rule* because it is written by the *Apostles and Evangelists*, *holy men moved by the Holy Ghost*. The Apostles did not lose their Infallibility when they committed what they preached to Writing; the same Spirit that assisted them in delivering the Doctrine by word of mouth, assisted them also when they delivered it by writing: and it is *a full* and *sufficient Rule*, because it containeth all things which are necessary for Men *to believe* and do in order to eternal life. Let them name

what

let them name what is neceſſary beyond what is *recommended* there, or may be *deduced* from thence: yea it doth contain not only *all the Eſſential* but alſo the *Integral* parts of the Chriſtian Religion; and therefore nothing can be any part of our Religion which is not there. The direction of old was, *Iſa.* 8. 20. *To the Law and to the Teſtimony, if they ſpeak not according to this word, it is becauſe there is no light in them.* Every thing was then tried *by Moſes and the Prophets*, and every thing muſt be now tried *by the Prophets and Apoſtles*, which is *our foundation* of *Faith*, *Worſhip*, and *Obedience*, Eph. 2. 20.

5. That which we blame in *the Papiſts* is, That they cry up a *private*, *unproved*, *unwritten Tradition* of their own, as of *equal Authority* with this *ſafe* and *full* Rule which is contained in the Written Word of God. Their crime and fault may be conſidered partly with reſpect to the *Object* and *Matter*, That theſe Traditions are not *indifferent Cuſtoms*, but *Eſſential Points*, neceſſary to *Faith* and *Chriſtian Practice*; and ſo though a Chriſtian be never ſo thorough and ſound in his Obedience to the Word of God, and true to *the Baptiſmal Covenant*, yet if he ſubmitteth not to theſe Unwritten Traditions, he wants ſome Point neceſſary to *Faith* and *Practice*, and ſo to *Life Eternal*; which is contrary to *Mark* 16. 16. *He that believeth and is Baptized ſhall be ſaved, and he that believeth not ſhall be damned:* And *Joh.* 17. 3. *This is life eternal, to know thee the only true God, and Jeſus Chriſt whom thou haſt ſent*: Partly as *to the Subject*, as they make their *own faction* to be the *only keepers* of theſe things, and that nothing is to be owned as *Apoſtolical Tradition*, but what is delivered as ſuch by their Authority; which is to leave the Church to the Tyranny and Uſurpation of a *corrupt Faction*, to declare for Apoſtolical Tradition any thing which ſerveth their *Ends* and *Intereſts*, and for which no *true Hiſtorical evidence* is produced. Now the unjuſt and fraudulent Practices which they have uſed to promote this Uſurpation over the Churches of Chriſt, render them of all men moſt unfit to be truſted in this kind; partly with reſpect to *the manner*, they will have theſe things to be received *Pari reverentia & pietatis affectu*; With the ſame reverence and pious affection with which we receive the holy Scriptures; and ſo *mans poſt* is ſet by Gods, and *unproved Traditions* equalled with *Doctrins of Faith:* their *opinion* is bad enough, but their *practice* is worſe, for there they ſhew they value theſe things more than the Scriptures; as Superſtition always aboundeth in its own things. Did ever any of their Doctors ſay the ſame things of Traditions which they take the boldneſs to ſay of Scripture? Did they ever call them *Pen and Inkhorn, or Parchment Divinity, a Noſe of Wax, a dumb Rule, an obſcure and ambiguous Doctrine:* Theſe *Blaſphemies* they vent boldly againſt the Scripture, but did they ever ſpeak thus of Traditions? and again their common People are a thouſand times better inſtructed in their Traditions than in the *Doctrine of Salvation*; they skill more of *Lent*, and *Ember-weeks*, *&c.* than they truly underſtand

the Doctrine of *Mans misery* and *remedy:* And call you this *equal reverence* and *pious affection* to the *Scriptures* and *Traditions?* Partly because they would never give us a *perfect Catalogue* of Unwritten Traditions necessary to be observed by all Christians; it may be left they should amaze the People with the multitude of them, or else that the People may not know how many of their Doctrins are destitute of Scripture-proof, and so they plainly be discovered to be imposers on the belief of the Christian World.

6. Though we blame this in Papists, yet we reject not *all Tradition:* 1. Because Scripture it self is a Tradition, as we proved before, and is conveyed to us by the most *credible means*, which we have no reason to doubt of; the Scriptures of the *Old Testament* were preserved by the *Jews*, to whom were committed the Oracles of God, *Rom.* 3. 2. And *Protestants* receive all the Books which they admitted into their *Canon.* And for the Books of the *New Testament* the Christian Church hath received them as the Writings of those whose Names they bear, and by the *constant Universal Tradition* of the Church they are transmitted to us; and we have no more reason to doubt of them, than we do of Statutes and Laws made by Kings and Parliaments, who lived long before we had a being. Yea, we may be much more confident, as the matter is of greater weight and consequence, and these Writings have the *signature* and stamp of Gods Spirit on them, and have been blessed by God to the converting and sanctifying of many Souls; and have been delivered down to us by a succession of Believers unto this very day: and by them Christianity hath been preserved in the World notwithstanding the wickedness of it; and hath held up head against all the encounters of time. The persecutions of adverse Powers, have not suppressed it, nor the disputes of Enemies silenced the Profession of it; but still from age to age Gods Truth is received and transmitted to Posterity.

2. Because the proof of Christianity depending upon matter of Fact, chiefly Christs rising from the dead, it can only be proved by a Testimony, which in so extraordinary a case must be made valuable and authorized to the World by the Miracles accompanying it. Now the notice of these things is brought to us by Tradition, which being unquestionable, giveth us as good ground of Faith as it did to them that lived in the Apostles time, and heard their Doctrine, and saw their Miracles. Gods wonderful works were never intended for the benefit of that Age only in which they were done, but for the benefit also of those that should hear of them by any credible means whatsoever, *Psal.* 145. 4. *Joel* 1. 3. *Psal.* 78. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7. These things were told them *that they might set their hope in God, &c.*

3. Because there are some Doctrins drawn by just consequence from Scripture, but are the more confirmed to us when they are backed with *constant Church-usage* and *practice*; as Baptism of Infants, Lords-day, Singing of Psalms in our Publick Worship, *&c.* 4. Be-

4. Becauſe there are certain words which are not found in Scripture indeed, yet agreeable thereunto, and are very uſeful to diſcover the frauds of Hereticks, as *Trinity*, *Divine Providence*, *Conſubſtantial Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt*, *Satisfaction*, *&c.*

5. We reject not all Church-Hiſtory, or the Records of ancient Writers concerning the Providences of God in their days, in owning the Goſpel, which make much for our inſtruction in manners, and are helps to encourage us to put our truſt in God.

6. There are *certain Uſages* and *innocent Cuſtoms*, or *Circumſtances* common or ſacred, and other actions, which we deſpiſe not but acknowledg and receive as far as their own variable nature and condition requireth, not rejecting them becauſe anciently practiſed; nor regarding them when the general Law of Edification requireth the omiſſion of them. But that which we deteſt is, That the Traditions of Men ſhould be made equal in Dignity and Authority with the expreſs Revelation of God: Yea, that manifeſt Corruptions and Uſurpations as making *Rome the Miſtreſs of other Churches*; and ſuperinducing the Pope *as the Head of the Univerſal viſible Church*, *and the Vicar of Chriſt without his leave and appointment*; and ſuch-like other Points ſhould be obtruded upon the World as Apoſtolical Traditions, and to be received with like Religious reverence as we do Articles of Faith ſet down in Scripture: This is that we cannot ſufficiently abhor as apparently falſe and deſtructive to Chriſtianity.

The Propoſitions drawn out of the Text in this Sermon are theſe.

1. Whatever aſſurance we have of Gods preſerving us in the Truth, yet we are bound to uſe diligence and caution.

2. Our diligence and caution is to be imployed about this, that we may ſtand faſt in the Faith of Chriſt, and the profeſſion and practice of Godlineſs.

3. That the means of ſtanding faſt in the Faith of Chriſt, and the profeſſion and practice of Godlineſs is by holding the Traditions which were taught by the Holy Apoſtles.

4. That while the Apoſtles were in being there were two ways of delivering the Truth by word of mouth, and Writing.

5. That now when they are long ſince gone to God, and we cannot receive from them the Doctrine of life by word of mouth; We muſt ſtick to the Scriptures or Written Word.

SERMON VII.

Mr Thomas Woolston

Popery is a Novelty, and the Proteſtants Religion was not only before *Luther*, but the ſame that was taught by Chriſt and his Apoſtles.

Jer. 6. 16. *Thus ſaith the Lord, ſtand ye in the way and ſee, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye ſhall find reſt for your Souls: But they ſaid, we will not walk therein.*

ALl Men in this World having for their Conſtituent parts a Mortal Body (*a*), and an Immortal Soul, are paſſing out of this Life into another: Out of this, becauſe of the Mortality (*b*) of the Body; into another, becauſe of the Immortality of the Soul. And all both good and bad are daily and hourly travelling to an everlaſting and unchangeable ſtate, whoſe Bodies ſhall be quickly turned into lifeleſs duſt, and their Souls enter into Heaven or Hell, and be with God or Devil (*c*), in Joy or Torment, when they come to their Journeys end; and according to the way they now walk in, ſo it will be with them for ever: Thoſe that walk in the way chalked out by God, at the end of this Life ſhall have the end of their Faith, and Hope and Holineſs, the Salvation of their Souls; but thoſe that walk after the fleſh, and in the ways of ſin, ſhall find Hell to be at the end of their walk. Therefore it is of Infinite concernment to all, to obſerve and do what is preſcribed in the Text, in which are contained theſe Parts following.

(*a*) Ψυχάριον ἐι βασάζον νέκρον. *Epictet.*

(*b*) In terra orimur, & in terra morimur, revertentes in eam unde ſumus aſſumpti. *Bernard in feſt.* St. *Martin.*

(*c*) Bona mors juſti propter requiem, melior propter novitatem, optima propter ſecuritatem. Mala peccatorum mors in mundi amiſſione, pejor in carnis ſeparatione, peſſima in vermis igniſque duplici contritione. *Idem Epiſt.* 105.

I. The *Duties* that are *enjoined*, and they are two. First, *to ask and enquire* after the right way that leads to Rest and Happiness; a Metaphor (*d*) taken from a Man that is upon his Journey, and not well acquainted with the way to his intended place, stands still and asketh, Which is my way to such a Town, I am bound and bent for such a Country? and if I mistake my way, I lose my self, my labour and my business; and being directed doth heedfully observe what is said unto him, and carefully remembers the marks that are told him, by which he might conclude that he is in his direct and ready way. Sirs, this is your case, you are bound for Heaven, you would all be happy when you die, and if *you mistake your way*, *you lose your selves*, *your Souls and Bodies too*, *and God and Christ*, *and Happiness*, *and all*, *and that for ever*: Stand then, and earnestly enquire (*e*), which is your way, and diligently observe what are the Marks whereby you might know that you are in the road to a Blessed, Glorious Life: and these in the Text are two.

(*d*) Similitudine utitur. *Calv. in loc.* Facite ut viatores solent, ubi dubitant, quà eundum sit. *Grot. in loc.*

(*e*) וְשַׁאֲלוּ לִנְתִיבוֹת Et Interrogate, (sub. alios sapientiores. *Vatab. in loc.* עוֹלָם Antiquis per quas iverunt Abraham, Jacob, &c. *Grot.*

First, It is the *old Way*; Seek not out new paths to Heaven, keep in the old Way that all the Millions of Saints now happy in the enjoyment of their God, went in: If you would get to the place where they be, you must go the same way they did. The old Way that *Abraham*, and *Isaac*, and *Jacob* went; the old Way that *Moses* and *David*, *Peter* and *Paul*, and all the holy, humble, and believing, penitent People of God did go.

Secondly, It is the *good Way* as well as *old*; for though Goodness was before Wickedness, yet every way that is old is not good (*f*); there is the old Way of *Swearing* and *Lying*, and *Drunkenness*; there is the old Way of *Hypocrisie*, *Impenitency*, and *Unbelief*; the old Way of *Whoredom*, and hating *Holiness*: This hath been the old Way, but a bad one, and that leads to Damnation: If you be in this Way and hold on in this Way, and go forwards, and do not turn, and that *quickly too*, you will be in everlasting torments, and that *quickly too*. Stand then and see that your Way be the good and the old Way.

(*f*) There is the old way of *Cain*, Jude v. 11. 1 *Joh.* 3. 12. *Gen.* 4. 8. and the old way of *Balaam*, 2 *Pet* 2. 15. but the way of Sin, though never so old leads to Hell, *Mat.* 7. 13.

Secondly, (*g*) The next Duty in the Text enjoined, is *to walk in this Way both old and good*, when you have found it; for if a man have the most exact knowledg of his Way, & shall sit down, and shall sit down or stand still, and not walk in it, he will never come to the place that Way doth lead unto. The Way is pointed out by God himself unto you; get up then, arise and walk therein, and that with haste and speed; your Way is to a long Eternity, the night of Death is coming upon you, be daily jogging on, do not loyter in your way; time goeth on, therefore so do you.

(*g*) וְלֵכוּ־בָהּ Per Metaphoram de vita, moribus, & actionibus.

II. In the Text there is by what *Authority* (h) *you are thus strictly enjoyned* to ask for, and walk in the good old Way; that is, by *Divine Authority*. [*Thus saith the Lord*, *stand ye in the ways and see*, *and ask*, *&c.*] It is the Lord that made thee, that doth thus command thee; it is *that* Lord that doth preserve thee, in whom thou dost live, and move, and hast

(*h*) Hic docet Propheta, non posse extenuari culpam populi, quasi errore peccasset quoniam satis superq; admonitus à Deo fuerat, *Calv.*

haſt thy being, that hath kept thee out of Hell all this while; thou haſt been going in the wrong way, and running in the paths that lead to deſtruction and damnation; it is *that* Lord that can damn thee, when he will, and that can inflict the puniſhments and plagues upon thee, that are due unto thee, for thy ſin againſt him; that could this day and hour caſt thy Body to the duſt, and thy Soul to Devils, that doth command thee to ſtand and ſee, whither thou art going; he ſeeth the way wherein thou art walking, and out of pity to thee, calleth after thee, ſaying, Poor Sinner! why art thou ſo ſwift, and makeſt ſuch haſte in the way of Sin? Why doſt thou run with ſo much ſpeed to a place of torment, as if thou couldeſt not get thither ſure enough, or ſoon enough; whereas the Way thou walkeſt in (except thou turn) will bring thee to eternal miſery, ſurely and quickly too? Oh ſtand and ſee, whither thou art going! ſtand and ſee that at the end of this thy ſinful walk thou wilt come unto a lake of burning Brimſtone; to a doleful Dungeon, to a place of torment, and of utter darkneſs! Oh ſtand and ſee, and look about thee if thou canſt behold any that are going to eternal Happineſs walking in that way and road that thou art daily travelling in! I therefore charge thee upon pain of everlaſting torment, as thou loveſt thy Soul, or ever wouldſt be received unto everlaſting joy and happineſs, go not on, turn back again; thou art out of thy way to reſt and glory, ſtand then and aſk, for the good old way and walk therein.

3. Here is *the incouragement propounded*, to ſtir you up to ask for, and walk in the good old way, and that is *(i) reſt for your Souls*. Reſt in ſome meaſure, and from ſome things for the preſent, and reſt perfect and perpetual in Heaven hereafter for ever. Oh what ails the ſons of men to be ſo mad upon their luſts and ways of ſin, that though God doth threaten them with everlaſting, reſtleſs, and [hereafter] remedileſs torments, will yet go on in the way that leads them thither! and though God promiſeth a place and ſtate of reſt, and love, and life, if they will turn their hearts and feet unto the ways that would bring them to it, will notwithſtanding keep their ſinful courſe! which brings to the next part in the words.

(i) ומיצאו מרגע לנפשכם רגע Subito motus, concitatus, volutus fuit; tranſitive, movit, volutavit, per antiphraſin, quievit. *Jer.* 49. 19. & 31. 2. Iſa. 51. 4. *Schindler:*

4. *The Obſtinacy and wilful rebellion of Sinners, and their reſolute purpoſe to the contrary* (k). God commands you to walk in a good way, but you will not; he promiſeth you reſt and happineſs, if you will, but yet you will not; and doth threaten you with death and hell, and yet you will not. Oh the hardneſs of your hearts! Oh the ſtubbornneſs of your wills! how great is it, when the *Precepts*, nor the *Promiſes*, nor the *threatnings* of the great, eternal God, will not make you bend, nor bow, nor buckle to his revealed Will! It is your own Will that will undo you, if you periſh. It is your Will that is the great enemy and rebel

(k) Hic ſignificat Propheta tantum ſtetiſſe per Judæos quo minus fruerentur rebus proſperis, & tranquillo ſtatu — & ſponte ſuiſſe miſeros, quia Deus propoſuerat illis fælicem ſtatum, ſed contemptam fuiſſe hanc gratiam ab ipſis, idque pervicaciter, nam hoc ſonant verba, ubi dicunt, non ambulabimus, *Calvin:*

bel againſt the bleſſed God, againſt his holy Law and Ways; do not plead and ſay, *thou canſt not* walk in the good old Way, when the reaſon is rather, becauſe *thou wilt not.* It is not ſo much your Impotency, as your obſtinacy that you do not leave your ſinful, and your wicked ways. You can forbear to ſwear, but you will not; you can leave your drunkenneſs, who compels you, who doth conſtrain and force you? you can but will not (*l*); who puts the cup ſo often to thy mouth but thine own hand, commanded ſo to do by thy own will? Who turns thy tongue to curſe and to blaſpheme the holy name of God but thy own will? Who compels thy feet to carry thee to a Whore-houſe? Doſt thou not voluntarily move thitherward, and thou goeſt, not becauſe thou *canſt not* forbear, but becauſe thou *wilt not* forbear to go? Moreover, as thou canſt leave many of thy wicked ways, if thou wilt, ſo thou canſt ſet upon a better courſe of life if thou wilt. Thou canſt go to Sermons if thou wilt, and thou canſt conſider of what thou hear-eſt if thou wilt; and thou canſt fall down upon thy knees and pray to God if thou wilt; who doth hinder thee but thine own will? And if thou wilt not do what thou canſt, is it not a plain caſe that thou wouldeſt not do more, though thou couldeſt? Do not plead that thou canſt not, till thou haſt done the beſt that thou canſt do, which yet unto this day thou never haſt done. If thou wert *now a dying* canſt thou ſay, thou haſt done thy beſt, and the moſt that thou couldeſt do to leave the way of ſin, and to walk in a better way? thy own Conſcience would condemn thee, and tell thee that thou haſt not. The day is haſtning when it ſhall be roundly told thee, in thy ear, thou mighteſt have been holy and ſo happy, but thou wouldſt not. Thou waſt called to come to Chriſt that thou mighteſt have lived, but thou wouldſt not. Thou waſt exhorted to ask for, and walk in the good old way; but the reaſon, *why thou didſt not, was becauſe thou wouldeſt not.* And how deſervedly are they damned, that are wilful in their ways, and are reſolved that in the good way they will not walk.

(*l*) Reprobatio Dei non ſubſtrahit aliquid de potentia reprobati — Unde licet aliquis non poſſit gratiam adipiſci, qui reprobatur à Deo, tamen quod in hoc peccatum vel illud labatur, ex ejus libero arbitrio contingit: Unde & meritò ſibi imputatur in culpam. *Aquin. par.* 1. *Queſt.* 23. *Art.* 3.

The Text according to theſe Parts contained in it, would afford ſo many Doctrines, which would yield matter for many Practical Sermons, but muſt all be omitted, becauſe I am limited to endeavour to make good this Poſition, *viz.* That *Popery is a Novelty, and the Proteſtants Religion was not only before* Luther, *but the ſame that was taught by Chriſt, and his Apoſtles.*

For the more clear and diſtinct proceeding in the handling of this Aſſertion, I ſhall caſt what I have to ſay (and can bring into one Sermon) into this Method:

Firſt, I *ſhall premiſe ſome certain Propoſitions for the better ſtating of the matter in hand.*

Secondly, *I will give you a parallel or compariſon of the Doctrines taught by the Prophets, Chriſt, and his Apoſtles, the Doctrines of the Proteſtants, or Reformed Churches, and the Doctrines of the Papiſts*; by which you may

may easily discern, that ours is the old and true, but theirs a new and false Religion.

Thirdly, *I will shew you that the same Religion and Doctrine professed and owned by the Protestants was* (after Christ and his Apostles) *before* Luther, *taught, and received by many.*

Fourthly, *I will give you an account of some of the material, essential Points of Popery, when they first sprung up in the Church, and when first made Articles of Faith, with such strictness that they should be accounted Hereticks that did not profess to believe them, but would oppose them*; that by their original and rise, you may rightly conclude that the charge of Novelty laid upon the Popish Religion is a just charge.

Fifthly, *I will make some Practical Application of the whole.*

The first part of the Method propounded contains these Eight Propositions.

First Proposition.

That the ordinary way in which lost sinners since the Fall of Adam *have been recovered and restored to Life and Salvation, as to the Essentials of the Covenant of Grace, in all ages hath been one and the same* (*m*). For though God hath at sundry times and in divers manners revealed his Will unto his Church, yet the Covenant of Grace (cast out to fallen man as a plank after shipwrack) under various external Dispensations, hath been the same; under the Law administred by *Promises, Prophesies, Sacrifices and Circumcision*, the *Paschal Lamb*, and *other Types and Ordinances* delivered to the People of the *Jews* (*n*), all pointing *at Christ to come*; under the Gospel by the *Preaching of the Word*, and *Administration of the Sacraments. Baptism, and the Lords-Supper*, which is done in Commemoration of the Death of Christ, *already past*. This way hath been the same to Heaven all along through Christ, successively from *Adam* to our days, and will be the same to the end of the World; which we might learn from the excellent Harmony, perfect agreement betwixt the Doctrine of *Moses*, the Prophets, and Christ and his Apostles; for these declaring the whole counsel of God, *Act.* 18. 27. did yet preach no new Doctrine concerning Christ and Salvation by him, but what *Moses* and the Prophets did say, and that also in reference to the Gentiles, as well as to the *Jews*, *Act.* 26. 22, 23. To believe on Christ, to love God above all, to repent, and mortifie Sin, to be sanctified and renewed after the Image of God, to be obedient to the Will of God, hath been the good way from of old. The new change in outward Administrations made by Christ, and the Apostles did not make a New way to Heaven, though the old Dispensations then did cease, and give place to those appointed by Christ, which with the Doctrines of the Apostles are retained in the Reformed Church, but are depraved, corrupted and departed from by the Church of *Rome*, as will appear by the parallel of Doctrines.

(*m*) Ea quippe fides justos servavit antiquos, quæ & nos. *i.e.* Mediatoris Dei & hominis Jesu Christi. *Aug. de natur. & grat:* cap. 44.

Heb. 1: 1. πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως.

(*n*) Christi veri Sacrificii multiplicia variaq; signa erant sacrificia priscа sanctorum, cum hoc unum per multa figuraretur, tanquam verbis multis res una diceretur, ut sine fastidio multum commendatur *Aug: de Civit: Dei, lib:* 10: *cap:* 20.

Second

Second Propoſition.

Antiquity is not a mark of a true Church; a Church of a long ſtanding and continuance ſucceſſively from age to age might be a falſe Church: The Church of *Rome* contrary *to all reaſon* makes Antiquity a mark (*o*), whereby a true Church might be known; and *contrary to all Hiſtory* brags of her own Antiquity. But that which is a diſtinguiſhing mark to difference one thing from another muſt be found *in* (p) *one kind, in all of that kind, only in that kind, and yet always in it*; as a man hath two feet, but thereby cannot be diſtinguiſhed from ſome other Creatures, becauſe this is common to birds as well as men: So to be skilful in Muſick is proper only to man, but not found in every man, and therefore no mark to know a man by; for one that is no Muſician is a true and real man, as well as he that is: So alſo there might be ſomething proper to one kind of beings, and only to that kind, and to every one of that kind, but not always; as Laughter to Mankind only, and to every one, but not always; for though no Creature can laugh but Man, yet one is as true and real Man when he doth not uſe that action, as when he doth. Again, though Man only is endued with Learning of Arts and Sciences amongſt living Creatures, yet to ſay this is a mark of a Man, were to ſay that moſt Men in the World were no Men; for the moſt are not ſo learned, and the Men that are now learned, were not always ſo, and yet had then the true and real nature of Men. But if you ſay, a Man hath a power or faculty to laugh, you then give a plain mark to diſtinguiſh him from all others, becauſe this power is proper *to Mankind only, to every one of Mankind, only, and always*; and therefore this being a property of Mankind, and inſeparable from any of that kind, a difference to diſtinguiſh man from all other living Creatures might be taken from thence, beſides the conſtitutive ſpecifical difference.

(*o*) Secunda nota Eccleſiæ eſt antiquitas; noſtra autem Eccleſia, quam adverſarii Papiſticam vocant, eſt illa ipſa, quam Chriſtus inſtituit, & proinde vetuſtior omnibus ſectis hæreticorum. *Bell. de concil. & Eccleſ. l.4. c.5.*

(*p*) Proprium convenit ſoli alicui ſpeciei, omnibuſq; illius Individuis & ſemper. Tres notarum conditiones ponit, *Bellarm.* 1. Debent eſſe propriæ non communes. debent eſſe. 2. Notiores, eâ re cujus ſunt notæ, alioqui non ſunt notæ, ſed ignotæ. 3. Sunt inſeparabiles à vera Eccleſia. *De Concil. & Eccleſ. Lib.4. cap. 2.*

By this plain familiar inſtance the common and unlearned people, (to whoſe capacity the deſign is to accommodate this Sermon) might underſtand ſomething of the nature of a mark, whereby one thing might be known from another, and applying this to the buſineſs in hand might make a judgment, that the Popiſh braggings of Antiquity, (alone conſidered) will fall ſhort of a demonſtration, or evidence, that the Church of *Rome* is the only true Church, that hereby ſhe cannot prove her ſelf to be a true Church; and that upon theſe two Grounds or Reaſons.

1. Becauſe *Antiquity is ſeparable from a true Church*, as the Church of God in *Adams* days was a true Church, and yet it was not then an ancient Church, when it firſt began; and the Chriſtian Church in the Apoſtles days was a true Chriſtian Church, and yet it was not then an ancient *Chriſtian* Church, no more than an Infant newly born might be ſaid to be an old man, and yet it is a true man, though not old.

2. Becauſe Antiquity is not only ſeparable from a true Church, but

is

is *also common to other things now as well as to a true Church*; yea, it might be spoken of the Synagogue of Satan, for as much as Satan hath had his followers in the World for many thousand years; and there have been many wicked and ungodly societies of men, far more ancient than the Church of *Rome*, or any *Pope* the Head thereof. So that the Antiquity that the Church of *Rome* boasts of (but hath not) cannot prove it to be the true Church of Christ, any more than the Synagogue of Satan. And that Antiquity, that indeed she hath, together with her Spiritual fornication may evidence her to be an *old harlot*, but not the true Church; for when she saith, she is so old as to be the Mother of all other Churches, we can name some Churches that she would have to be her Daughters to be more ancient than the Church of *Rome*; but it is absurd to say the Mother is younger than any of the Daughters.

Third Proposition.

As Antiquity is not a mark of a true Church, so neither is *Antiquity a note of true Doctrine*; for although all truth is more ancient than error (error being a corruption of truth) yet every Doctrine that is old, or of many hundred (*q*) years standing is not therefore true; for there are *old errors*, and *old heresies*, yea such as are more ancient than those that are *properly and formally* Popish Errors. There are the old Errors and Heresies of *Cerinthus*, *Ebion*, *Arrius*, and many more, of a sooner and more early original, than the main Doctrines of Popery, that are essential to that Religion; and if we judg of Doctrines meerly by Antiquity, many Heresies have the precedency before Popery. Since then Wickedness and Error can plead Antiquity of many Ages; it is plain that *Antiquity is a praise or dispraise, according to the nature of the thing of which it is spoken; if it be good, the older, the better; if it be bad, the older, the worser*; continuance in Sin being an aggravation of it; as an old Swearer, an old Drunkard or Idolater is worse than one that hath lately taken up such wicked practices. Antiquity of Doctrine and Worship without truth and purity being but (*r*) grey-headed Error and Sin, it follows that the longer the Church of *Rome* hath embraced such Worship, and taught such Doctrines, she is not so venerable for her Antiquity, as vile for her Iniquity.

(*q*) Quodcunque adversus veritatem sapit, hoc erit hæresis, etiam vetus consuetudo. *Tertul. de Virg. Veland.*

(*r*) Consuetudo sine veritate, vetustas erroris est. *Cypr. Epist. ad Pomptium.*

Fourth Proposition.

Some of the Popish Doctrines, and some parts of Popish Worship are older, and of a longer standing than some other be. *Rome* was not built in one day; and the body and system of Popish Doctrine, as now it is held, was not finished in one age. Popery came in by degrees, and Antichrist did rise to this height as now he is in, step by step. The (*s*) Question propounded by the Papists to be resolved by the Protestants

(*s*) In omni insigni mutatione religionis semper

ista sex demonstrari possunt. 1. Auctor ejus. 2. Dogma aliquod novum. 3. Tempus quo cæpit. 4. Locus ubi cæpit. 5. Quis eam oppugnaverit. 6. Exiguus aliquis cætus unde paulatim aliis accedentibus, creverit. Nihil autem horum de nobis ostendere possunt, (sub. Hæretici.) *Bellarm. de Concil. & Eccles. lib. 4. cap. 5.*

ſtants, ſaying, *Who was the firſt Pope that brought in their Religion? and who was the firſt that made all the Innovations we complain of?* is ridiculous and abſurd, ſuppoſing that to be introduced into the Church by one man, in one age, which was brought in gradually, by many men, in many ages.

Fifth Propoſition.

Thoſe things that are eſſential to our Religion, are owned by the Papiſts themſelves; for they do profeſs to own the *Scripture* to be the Word of God, and that it is certainly true; but do add their own *Traditions*, things not contained in the Scripture, yet *neceſſary* to Salvation, which we cannot receive. They own *Chriſt to be the Head of the Church*, and ſo do we; but they add and ſay, That the *Pope is the Head* of the Univerſal Church alſo, but ſo do not we. They own *Baptiſm and the Lords-Supper*, ſo do we; but they add five Sacraments more, which we deny. They own that there is an *Heaven and an Hell*, as well as we, but they teach that there was a place diſtinct from both, in which the Souls of Believers were before Chriſts death. And that there is a Purgatory, and a place for the Souls of Infants, *diſtinct* from Heaven and Hell, all which we do deny. They own the *Merits of Chriſt*, and ſo do we; but they add their own Merits, which we deny; and ſo in other Points. So that the Controverſie betwixt us and them is not, Whether what we hold be true and old, for that is granted by the Papiſts themſelves (*t*), as to the eſſential parts of our Religion, but about what they have invented, and added to the true Religion. All our Religion is contained in the Scripture, and what is there, we own, and nothing elſe as neceſſary to Salvation. The ſum of our Religion is comprehended in the *Ten Commandments*, *Creed*, *and Lords-Prayer*, which the Papiſts alſo do confeſs and own. So that our Religion is paſt diſpute, and is in a manner granted to us: But whether the Popiſh Doctrines as ſuch, be true and old, is the very Controverſie betwixt us and them.

(*t*) Nota ſecundo ea quæ ſunt ſimpliciter neceſſaria Apoſtolos conſueviſſe omnibus prædicare, — Dico, illa omnia Scripta eſſe ab Apoſtolis, quæ ſunt omnibus neceſſaria, & quæ ipſi palam omnibus vulgo prædicaverunt. *Bell. de Verb. Dei. Lib.* 4. *cap.* 11.

Sixth Propoſition.

From the former follows this, That *there are more things eſſential to the Popiſh Religion as ſuch then there are to our Religion.* They do own our Eſſentials, but we deny theirs. Thoſe in which we and they do agree, are acknowledged by both to be true and old; thoſe in which we differ from them, we truly ſay are New.

Seventh Propoſition.

The Reformation of the Church doth not conſiſt in bringing in of New things, but in caſting them out, and paring them off: It is a groſs miſtake that in the Reformation, *in and ſince Luthers time*, the Church hath brought in new Doctrines, and rejected the old: But (which is the truth) hath caſt away the new, and retaineth the old. Gold and droſs were mixed together, the Jewel of Truth was hid under the filth of corrupt Doctrines, our Reformers kept the Jewel and the Gold, and caſt the droſs and filth away. *The Reception of the old Doctrine, and the*

Re-

Rejection of the New is that which made the Reformation. And if the Church of *Rome* would own what is in the Scripture, and no more, as neceſſary to Salvation, and would cut off the New, which they have added to the Old, we and they ſhould be of the ſame Religion. Our Religion was perfect and compleat before the Doctrine and the Worſhip of the Church of *Rome*, (as now it is) were in being; and if you give a Coat to a Man, and he afterwards put ſome pieces to it, long after it was a Coat, if you ask a *Mendicant*, or a Beggar in the ſtreet, he may tell you, that is the New part which was put to it, after it was a perfect Coat.

Eight Propoſition.

To know which is the Old Religion and the New, we muſt keep to the Word (u) *of God, as the rule and teſt thereof.* What is not in the Word of God, no way, neither *expreſly*, *nor by juſt*, *immediate*, *neceſſary conſequence*; and yet is made neceſſary to Salvation is certainly a New Religion; though it hath been taught many hundred years. Thus all falſe gods though long ſince ſerved and worſhipped are called New gods, that newly came up, *Deut.* 32. 17. The Old Religion then muſt be examined by the Old Rule, the Holy Scriptures; ſo that to determine this, we need not run to the *Canons* of the Church, the *Councils* of Men, to the *Decrees* of the Pope, to the *Writings* of the Fathers, which are all fallible, and of later ſtanding than the Word of God, as being before any ſuch *Councils*, *Canons*, *Conſtitutions* and *Writings of Men*, ſince the Apoſtles time. When therefore the Papiſts ask you, Where was your Religion before *Luther*? you might confidently anſwer, Where their Religion *never was*, *nor will be found*; and that is, in the holy Scriptures, which was long before *Luther* was, or the *Pope* either. But if you ask them, Where *was their Religion in the Apoſtles times*, *and ſeveral hundred years after Chriſt*, you will put them hard to it to ſhew you, nay they cannot do it.

(u) Si ad divinæ traditionis caput, & originem revertamur, ceſſat error humanus. *Cypr. Epiſt. ad Pomp.*

The ſecond General Head in the Method propoſed, is to give you a parallel of Doctrines taught by the *Prophets*, *Chriſt*, *and his Apoſtles*; by the *Proteſtants* or *Reformed Church*; by the *Papiſts* or the *Church of Rome*. The firſt ſhall be laid down *in the very words of Scripture*. The ſecond out of the *publick Confeſſions of faith of the Reformed Church* in *England*, and beyond the Seas. The Third out of *the Writings and Decretals of the Popes*, *Councils*, *Cardinals*, *and other Doctors* approved by the Church of *Rome*. By all which the Three Things contained in this Poſition will be made manifeſt. Firſt, That *the Doctrine of Proteſtants is the ſame*, *that was taught by Chriſt and his Apoſtles*. Secondly, *That therefore it was long before* Luther. Thirdly, That *the Doctrine of the Church of* Rome, *differing from*, *and being contrary to the Doctrine of Chriſt and his Apoſtles muſt be a very Novelty*. But here I have not time nor room to make this Compariſon in all points of differing Doctrine betwixt us and them, but ſhall make choice of ſome out of many, but

enough to prove the thing asserted. A Parallel of the Doctrines of Prophets, Christ and his Apostles, the Protestants and Papists.

I. *Concerning the perfection and sufficiency of the Scripture unto Salvation.*

I. The Doctrine of the Prophets, Christ and Apostles concerning this Point:

Deut. 12. 32. *Whatsoever things I command you, observe to do it, thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it.* Psal. 19. 7. *The Law of the Lord is perfect, converting the Soul.* Joh. 20. 31. *But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing you might have life through his name.* Gal. 1. 8. *But though we or an Angel from Heaven preach any other Gospel unto you, than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed.* 9. *As I said before, so say I now again, if any man preach any other Gospel to you, than that you have received, let him be accursed.* 2 Tim. 3. 15. *And that from a child thou hast known the holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto Salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus.* 16. *All Scripture is given by Inspiration of God, and is profitable for Doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness.* 17. *That the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works.* Rev. 22. 18. *For I testifie unto every man that heareth the words of the Prophesie of this Book, if any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this Book.* 19. *And if any man shall take away from the words of the Book of this Prophesie, God shall take away his part out of the Book of Life, and out of the holy City, and from the things which are written in this Book.*

II. The Doctrine of the Reformed Churches concerning the Perfection and Sufficiency of the Scripture unto Salvation.

(w) Church of *Engl.* Artic. 6. (w) *The holy Scripture containeth all things necessary for Salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an Article of the Faith, or be thought requisite and necessary to Salvation.*

(x) Artic. 20. (x) *It is not lawful for the Church to ordain any thing, that is contrary to Gods Word:----as it ought not to decree any thing against the same,* so besides *the same ought it not to enforce any thing to be believed for necessity of Salvation.*

(y) Assemb. Confession of Faith. *The whole Counsel of God concerning all things necessary for his own Glory, mans Salvation, Faith and Life, is either expresly set down in Scripture, or by good and necessary consequence may be deduced from Scripture; unto which nothing at any time is to be added, whether by new Revelations of the Spirit, or Traditions of men* (y).

The Canonical Scripture, or the Word of God delivered by the Holy Ghost, and

and by the Prophets and Apoſtles propounded to the world is the moſt perfect and ancient Philoſophy, doth alone perfectly contain all piety, all rule of life (z).

(z) Confeſſio: Helvet. Synta. Confeſ. p. 67.

The Reformed Church in *France* thus (a). "Whereas the Word "of God is the ſumm of all Truth, containing whatſoever is requiſite "to the Worſhip of God and our Salvation; we affirm that it is not law- "ful for Men or Angels either to add any thing to it, or take away any "thing from it, nor to change any thing at all therein; from whence it "follows, that it is not lawful to ſet, either Antiquity, or Cuſtom, or a "Multitude, or Humane Wiſdom, Opinions, Decrees, Councils, or "Viſions, or Miracles, in oppoſition to Divine Scripture; but rather "that all things ought to be examined and tried according to this Rule, "and what is preſcribed therein.

(a) Quum Verbum Dei ſit omnis veritatis ſumma, complectens quicquid ad cultum Dei & ſalutem noſtram requiritur, neq; hominibus, neque ipſis etiam Angelis fas eſſe dicimus quicquam ei verbo adjicere, vel detrahere, vel quicquam prorſus in eo immutare: Ex hoc autem efficitur, neque antiquitatem, conſuetudines, neq; multitudinem, neq; Humanam Sapientiam, neq; Judicia, neq; Edicta vel Decreta ulla, neq; Concilia, neq; Viſiones, neq; Miracula, Scripturæ illi Divinæ opponere licere: Sed potius omnia ad ejus regulam & præſcriptum examinari & exigi oportere, *Gallic. Confeſ. in Syntag. Confeſ. p.* 78.

The *Belgick* Confeſſion thus (b). "We believe that the Holy Scrip- "ture doth perfectly contain the Will of God, and that whatſoever is "neceſſary to be believed by men, for the obtaining of Salvation, is "ſufficiently taught therein.--------For when it is forbidden that any "ſhould add to it, or take away from it, thereby is abundantly de- "monſtrated, that the Doctrine thereof is moſt perfect, and every "way compleat.

(b) Credimus ſacram hanc Scripturam, Dei voluntatem perfectè complecti, & quodcunq; ab hominibus, ut ſalutem conſequantur, credi neceſſe eſt, in illa ſufficienter edoceri? — Quum enim vetitum ſit, ne quis Dei verbo quicquam addat, aut detrahat, ſatis eo ipſo demonſtratur, Doctrinam illius perfectiſſimam, omnibuſque modis conſummatam eſſe. *Belg. Eccleſ. Confeſ. Syntag. p.* 131.

Wittember. Confeſ. (c) "That all Doctrine neceſſary to be known "by us in order to true and eternal Salvation is not contained in the "Scripture is ſooner ſaid than proved. To add no more, by theſe it is evident that in this point the Reformed Churches do not only agree among themſelves, but alſo with the Prophets and Apoſtles, teaching herein the ſame Doctrine that Chriſt and they did, which was the thing to be proved.

(c) In hac Scriptura non contineri omnem Doctrinam, nobis ad veram & perpetuam ſalutem cognitu neceſſariam, — videtur facilius poſſe dici, quàm probari. *Wittemb. Confeſ. Syntag. pag.* 130.

III. The Doctrine of the Papiſts concerning the Perfection and Sufficiency of the Scripture.

The *Council of Trent* declared (d), "That the Doctrine of the Go- "ſpel

(d) Sacroſancta — Tridentina ſynodus — perſpiciens hanc veritatem [Evangelii] & diſciplinam contineri in libris Scriptis, & ſine Scripto Traditionibus. ——— Omnes libros tam veteris quam Novi Teſtamenti ——— Nec non Traditiones ipſas, tum ad fidem, tum ad mores pertinentes, ——— Pari pietatis affectu ac reverentiâ ſuſcipit & veneratur. *Concil. Trident. Seſſ.* 4.

"ſpel is contained in the Written Word, and in Unwritten Traditions, "and that they did receive and honour the Unwritten Traditions, whe- "ther appertaining to Faith, or Manners, with the ſame reverence and "holy affection, as they did all the Books of the Old and New Teſta- "ment.

(e) Et revera tantâ reverentiâ apicem præfatæ Apoſtolicæ ſedis omnes ſuſpiciunt. — Ut antiquam Chriſtianæ Religionis inſtitutionem magis ab ore præceſſoris ejus, quam à ſacris paginis, & paternis Traditionibus expetant: illius velle, illius nolle tantum explorant, ut ad ejus arbitrium ſuam converſationem & ipſi remittant, aut intendant. *Corp. jur. Canon. Diſt.* 40. *ſi Papa in Annot.*

The *Canon Law* ſaith (e), "That men do with ſuch reverence re- "ſpect the Apoſtolical Seat of *Rome*, that they rather deſire to know the "ancient Inſtitution of Chriſtian Religion from the Popes mouth, than "from the holy Scriptures; and they only enquire what is his pleaſure, "and according to it, they order their Life and Converſation. Again, "(f) that the [Popes] *Decretal Epiſtles are to be numbred with Canonical* "*Scripture.*

(f) Inter Canonicas Scripturas Decretales Epiſtolæ connumerantur. *Corp. juris Canon. Diſt.* 19. *cap.* 6.

Dr. *Standiſh* in his Book againſt *Engliſh* Bibles ſaith, "Take from "them the *Engliſh* damnable Tranſlations, and let them learn to give "as much credit, to that which is not expreſſed, as to that which is "expreſſed in the Scripture.

(g) Multa pertinere [docet] ad Chriſtianorum fidem & Doctrinam quæ nec apertè, nec obſcurè, in ſacris literis continentur. — Sanctorum Martyrum auxilium precibus implorandum, eorumque memorias celebrandas, Imagines venerandas eſſe, in Sacrificio Euchariſtiæ ſimul cum corpore ſanguinem ſacerdotibus eſſe, & conficiendum, & ſumendum, *&c.* Sacræ literæ nuſquam fortè tradiderunt. At ejuſmodi atq; alia pleraq; id genus, ita firmiter Eccleſia Catholica retinet, ut ſi ſacris codicibus ſuiſſent inſcripta: *Melch. Can. loc. Theolog. Lib.* 3. *cap.* 3. Adde, quod ad confutandos Hæreticos major vis in Traditione, quàm in Scriptura eſt. — Quorſum hæc tam longo Sermone repetita? Nempe ut intelligas, non modò adverſum hæreticos plus habere Traditionem, quàm Scripturam virium, ſed etiam omnem fermè cum hæreticis diſputationem ad Traditiones à majoribus acceptas eſſe referendam: *Ibid.*

(g) *Melchior Canus* writeth, "That many things belong to Chriſtian "Faith and Doctrine, which are neither plainly nor obſcurely contained "in holy Scripture. And he doth give particular Inſtances, "That "the help of the holy Martyrs ſhould be craved by Prayer, and their "Memories celebrated, and their Images worſhipped, and ſuch-like, is "not taught in the holy Scripture, and yet the Catholick Church doth "as firmly hold theſe and many ſuch-like Doctrines as if they were writ- "ten in holy Scripture.-----Again he ſays, "There is more efficacy for "confutation of Hereticks in Tradition, than in Scripture.-----Again, "Almoſt all Diſputations with Hereticks ſhould be referred to the Tra- "ditions received from our fore-fathers.

(b) Multòque maxima pars Evangelii pervenit ad nos Traditione, perexigua literis eſt Mandata: *Hoſius confeſ. Fid. Cathol. cap.* 92. *pag.* 133. *fol.*

(b) Cardinal *Hoſius* ſpeaks out, ſaying, "The greateſt part of the

"Goſpel

" Gospel is come to us by Tradition, very little of it is committed to " Writing.

By this, Reader, thou maist plainly perceive that the Doctrine of the Papists in this, is expresly contrary to the Doctrine of the Prophets, Christ, and his Apostles, and that the Doctrine of the Protestants is the very same with the Doctrine of Christ and the Apostles: compare them together, and thou will see the agreement of the one, and the contrariety of the other, to the Doctrine of Scripture, and conclude that the Doctrine of the Reformed Church is the *old and true*, but the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, is both *new and false* Doctrine; And that what the *Rhemists* on *Gal.* 1. 8. say, *It is great pity and shame that so many follow* Luther *and* Calvin, and *such other lewd Fellows into a new Gospel*; is more true of, and better applied to the followers of the Popish Doctors, or of the *Rhemists* themselves; who on 2 *Tim.* 3. 16. say, *The Hereticks upon this commendation of holy Scriptures, pretend (very simply in good sooth) that therefore nothing is neeessary to Justice and Salvation but Scriptures.* And on *Joh.* 21. 25. *Few things are written of Christs Acts and Doctrine in comparison of that which he did and spake, and yet the Hereticks will needs have all in Scripture.* Whereas the Evangelist saith not, That any thing is omitted of his Doctrine, but of his Acts: For though he spake more words than be expressed, yet all the Doctrines that he uttered in those words, is contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament. The Apostles preached nothing but that which was contained in the Scriptures, *Act.* 17. 11. *&* 26. 22. *Rom.* 1. 2. *Fulk in loc.*

II. *Of Reading of the Scripture.*

I. The Doctrine of the Prophets, Christ, and Apostles concerning the common Peoples reading and knowing of the Scripture.

Deut. 31. 12, *Gather the people together, men, and women, and children, and thy stranger that is within thy gates, that they may hear, and that they may learn and fear the Lord your God, and observe to do all the words of this Law.* 13. *And that their children which have not known any thing, may hear and learn to fear the Lord your God, as long as ye live in the Land.* Josh. 8. 35. *There was not a word of all that* Moses *commanded, which* Joshua *read not before all the Congregation of Israel, with the women and the little ones, and the strangers that were conversant among them.* Psal. 1. 2. *His delight is in the Law of the Lord, and in his Law doth he meditate day and night.* Act. 8. 28. ----*Was returning and sitting in his Chariot read* Isaias *the Prophet.* Joh. 5. 39. *Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testifie of me.* Act. 17. 11. *And these were more noble than those in* Thessalonica, *in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so.* Ephes. 3. 4. *Whereby when ye read ye may understand*

derſtand my knowledg in the myſtery of Chriſt. Col. 3. 16. *Let the word of God dwell in you richly in all wiſdom:* 1 Theſ. 5. 27. *I charge you by the Lord that this Epiſtle be read unto all the holy Brethren.* 2 *Tim.* 3. 15: *And that from a child thou haſt known the holy Scriptures.*-------Rev. 1. 3. *Bleſſed is he that readeth and they that hear the words of this Propheſie, and keep thoſe things that are written therein.*

II. The Doctrine of the Proteſtants and Reformed Churches concerning the Peoples reading and knowing of the Scriptures.

" Becauſe the Original Tongues are not known to all the People of " God, who have right unto, and intereſt in the Scriptures, and are " commanded in the fear of God to read and ſearch them, therefore they " are to be Tranſlated.----------All ſorts of People are bound to read it [The Word of God] apart by themſelves, and with their Families.-----

(*i*) Omnibus ſacras literas privatim legere domi, & inſtruendo ædificare mutuum

------(*i*) " It is lawful for all men privately at home to read the holy " Scriptures, and by Inſtructions to edifie one another in the true Re- " ligion.-------

in vera Religione liceat. *Confeſ. Helvet. cap.* 22.

III. The Doctrine of the Papiſts concerning the Peoples having, or reading of the Scripture.

(*k*) Cum experimento manifeſtum ſit, ſi ſacra Biblia vulgari lingua paſſim ſine diſcrimine permittantur, plus inde, ob hominum temeritatem, detrimenti, quam utilitatis oriri, hac in parte judicio Epiſcopi, aut Inquiſitoris ſtetur, ut cum conſilio Parochi, vel confeſſorii,

(*k*) " Whereas experience teacheth, that if the Bible be every-where " without difference, permitted in the vulgar Tongue, through mens " unadviſedneſs, more hurt than good doth ariſe thereby, in this point " let the judgment of the Biſhop, or Inquiſitor be followed; that with " the advice of the Pariſh-Prieſt, or Confeſſor, they may grant the rea- " ding of the Bible, Tranſlated by Catholick Authors, in the vulgar " language, to ſuch as they ſhall underſtand, can take no hurt by ſuch " reading, but increaſe of Faith and Godlineſs. The which Licenſe let " them have in writing. And if any preſume without ſuch Licenſe ei- " ther to read or have it, unleſs they firſt deliver up their Bibles to the " Ordinary, they may not have the pardon of their ſins. And the Book- " ſellers, that without ſuch Licenſe, ſhall ſell, or any way afford Bibles " in the vulgar Language, ſhall forfeit the price of the Books, to be " converted by the Biſhop to pious uſes, and be liable to ſuch other pe- " nalties according to the quality of the offence, as the Biſhop ſhall " think meet.

Bibliorum, à Catholicis auctoribus verſorum, lectionem in vulgari lingua eis concedere poſſint, quos intellexerint, ex hujuſmodi lectione non damnum, ſed fidei atq; pietatis augmentum capere poſſe, quam facultatem in Scriptis habeant. Qui autem abſq; tali facultate ea legere, aut habere, præſumpſerint, niſi prius Bibliis Ordinario redditis, peccatorum abſolutionem percipere non poſſint. Bibliopolæ verò, qui prædictam facultatem non habenti, Biblia Idiomate vulgari conſcripta vendiderint, vel alio quovis modo conceſſerint, librorum pretium, in uſus pios ab Epiſcopo convertendum, amittant, aliiſque pœnis pro delicti qualitate ejuſdem Epiſcopi arbitrio ſubjaceant. *Index. Lib. prohib. Regul.* 4.

Though

Though this is not agreeable to the Doctrine of Christ and his Apostles that men must not read the Scripture without a License from men, for so what is strictly commanded by God, would be at the pleasure of others, whether God be obeyed or no, and some liberty by Pope *Pius* the Fourth doth seem to be granted for the reading of the Bible, to whom they please, yet it is taken away fully by Pope *Clement* the Eighth, in his Observation of this before alledged Rule, in these words.

(*l*) "It is to be observed concerning this Rule of *Pius* the Fourth, "that by this Impression and Edition, no new Power is granted to Bi- "shops, or Inquisitors, or Superiors, to license the buying, reading, "or keeping the Bible in the vulgar Tongue, seeing hitherto by the "command and practice of the holy *Roman*, and Universal Inquisition, "the power of granting such Licenses, to read or keep Bibles in the "vulgar Language, or any parts of the holy Scripture, as well of the "New as of the Old Testament, or any sums or Historical Abridgments "of the same, in any vulgar Language, hath been taken from them; "which inviolably is to be observed.

(*l*) Animadvertendum est circa supra scriptam quartam Regulam Indicis *Pii Papæ* IV. nullam per hanc Impressionem & Editionem de novo tribui facultatem Episcopis, vel Inquisitoribus, aut Regularium Superioribus, concedendi Licentiam emendi, legendi, aut retinendi Biblia vulgari Lingua edita, cum hactenus mandato & usu sanctæ Romanæ & universalis Inquisitionis sublata eis fuerit facultas concedendi hujusmodi Licentias legendi, vel retinendi Biblia vulgaria, aut alias Sacræ Scripturæ tam novi, quam veteris Testamenti partes quavis vulgari Lingua editas: ac insuper summaria & compendia etiam Historica eorundum Bibliorum, seu Librorum Sacræ Scripturæ, quocunque vulgari Idiomate conscripta: quod quidem inviolate servandum est. *Ind. Lib. prohib. Observat. circa Reg.* 4.

(*m*) Cardinal *Bellarmine* to the same purpose teacheth, "That the "People would get not only no good but much hurt from the Scrip- "tures; for they would easily take occasion of erring, both in Doc- "trines of Faith, and in Precepts concerning Life and Manners.

(*m*) Populus non solum non caperet fructum ex Scripturis, sed etiam caperet detrimentum: Acciperet enim facillimè occasionem errandi, tum in Doctrina fidei, tum in præceptis vitæ & morum. *Bellar. de Verb. Dei. Lib.* 2. *cap.* 15.

Peresius (quoted by Dr. *White*) saith, "Shall no bounds be set to po- "pular, rude, and carnal men? Shall old men, before they have put off "the filth of their mind, and young men that yet speak like children, be "admitted to read the Scripture? I suppose verily (and my opinion "fails me not) this Ordinance under the pretence of Piety, was inven- "ted by the Devil.

The *Rhemists* Translators in their Preface write in these words. "Which Translation we do not publish upon Erroneous opinion of ne- "cessity, that the holy Scriptures should always be in our Mother- "tongue, or that they ought, or were ordained of God to be read in- "differently of all.------Or that we generally and absolutely deemed it "more convenient in it self, and more agreeable to Gods Word and "Honour, or edification of the Faith to have them turned into vulgar "Tongues

"Tongues, than to be kept and ſtudied only in the Eccleſiaſtical learned "Languages.------The wiſe will not regard what ſome wilful People do "mutter, That the Scriptures are made for all men; and that it is of "envy that the Prieſts do keep the holy Book from them: Which ſug- "geſtion cometh of the ſame Serpent that ſeduced our firſt Parents, who "perſwaded them that God had forbidden them that tree of Knowledg, "leſt they ſhould be as cunning as himſelf, and like unto the Higheſt. "No, no, the Church doth it to keep them from blind ignorant pre- "ſumption, and from that which the Apoſtle calls, Knowledg, falſly ſo "called, and not to bar them from the true Knowledg of Chriſt.------ "She knoweth how to do it without caſting the holy to Dogs, or "pearls to Hogs.

Bravely ſaid! O the excellent art of the Mother-Church, that by keeping of her Sons and Daughters ignorant of the Word of God (the means of Knowledg) keeps them from blindneſs and ignorance! Who ever thought that to keep People in ignorance had been the way to keep them from it? What pretty conceit is this that they bar the People from knowing the Scripture, and yet do not bar them from the Knowledg of Chriſt? When Chriſt bids us *Search the Scriptures, for they are they that teſtifie of him.*

III. *Of Religious Worſhip in a known Tongue.*

I. The Doctrine of the Scripture concerning this Point.

1 Cor. 14.2. *He that ſpeaketh in an unknown tongue ſpeaketh not to men, but to God, for no man underſtandeth him; howbeit in the ſpirit he ſpeaketh myſteries.* Read ver. 3,4,5,6,7,8,-----9. *So likewiſe ye except ye utter by the tongue words eaſie to be underſtood, how ſhall it be known what is ſpoken? for ye ſhall ſpeak unto the air.* v.11. *If I know not the meaning of the voice, I ſhall be to him that ſpeaketh a Barbarian, and he that ſpeaketh ſhall be a Barbarian unto me.* 14. *For if I pray in an unknown tongue, my ſpirit prayeth, but my underſtanding is unfruitful.* 16. *Elſe when thou ſhalt bleſs with the ſpirit, how ſhall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned, ſay Amen, at thy giving of thanks, ſeeing he underſtandeth not what thou ſayeſt.* 18. *I thank my God I ſpeak with tongues more than you all.* 19. *Yet in the Church I had rather ſpeak five words with my underſtanding, that by my voice I might teach others alſo, than ten thouſand words in an unknown tongue.* Read alſo *ver.* 22,23,24,25,26,27,28.

II. The Doctrine of the Reformed Churches concerning Religious Worſhip in a known Tongue.

(n) Ang. Artic. 24. (n) "It is a thing plainly repugnant to the Word of God, and the "cuſtom of the Primitive Church, to have publick Prayer in the Church, "or to miniſter Sacraments in a Tongue not underſtood by the "People.

(o) Becauſe

(o) "Becauſe the Original Tongues are not known to all the Peo- "ple, who have right unto, and intereſt in the Scriptures, and are com- "manded in the fear of God to read and ſearch them, therefore they are "to be Tranſlated into the vulgar Language of every Nation unto "which they come, that the Word of God dwelling plentifully in all, "they might Worſhip him in an acceptable manner.------ (o) Aſſemb. Confeſ.

(p) "Let all things in the Church be done decently and in order, fi- "nally let all things be done to edification; therefore let all ſtrange "Tongues keep ſilence in the holy Aſſemblies; let all things be utter- "ed in the vulgar Tongue, which is underſtood of all men in the com- "pany. (p) Omnia decenter & ordine fiant in Eccleſia, omnia deniq; fiant ad ædificationem, taceant ergo omnes peregrinæ linguæ in cætibus ſacris: omnia proponantur lingua vulgari, quæ eo in loco ab hominibus in cætu intelligatur. *Confeſ. Helvet. cap.* 22.

(q) "Contrary to the expreſs command of the Holy Ghoſt, in the "Church all things are ſaid and ſung in a language which the People do "not underſtand. (q) Contra expreſſum ſpiritus ſancti præceptum, in ea omnia dicuntur & canuntur lingua, quam populus non intelligit. *Confeſ. Argentinenſ. cap.* 21.

(r) "What hath been already ſaid concerning the uſe of a Language "known to the common People, is to be underſtood not only in ſinging "of Pſalms, but alſo of all the parts of the Eccleſiaſtical Miniſtry; "for as Sermons and Prayers ought to be in a Tongue known unto the "Church, ſo alſo ſhould the Sacraments be diſpenſed in a known Lan- "guage; for though it be lawful for the ſake of the Learned ſometimes "to uſe a ſtrange Tongue, yet the conſent of the Univerſal Church re- "quires [proves this] that the neceſſary ſervices of the Church ſhould "be done in the Mother-tongue. (r) Quod jam dictum eſt de uſu Linguæ vulgo notæ, intelligendum eſt non tantum de cantu Pſalmorum, ſed etiam de omnibus partibus Eccleſiaſtici Miniſterii. Sicut enim conciones & precationes lingua Eccleſiæ nota habendæ ſunt, ita & Sacramenta noto Sermone diſpenſanda ſunt. Etſi enim licebit aliquoties peregrinâ linguâ propter ſtudioſos uti, tamen conſenſus Catholicæ Eccleſiæ hoc exigit, ut neceſſaria Miniſteria Eccleſiæ fiant Sermone vernaculo. *Confeſ. Wittemb. de horis Canon.*

(s) "Our [Miniſters] uſe all diligent endeavours that they may "teach in the Church and preach the Word of the Goſpel, without "mixture of Humane Traditions; do read the very Goſpels and other "Scriptures in the Churches in the vulgar Tongue, and after do inter- "pret them to the People. (s) Noſtri omnem operam navant, ut verbum Evangelii, impermixtum Humanis Traditionibus, in Eccleſia docenat ac prædicent, proinde ipſa Evangelia, nec non alias Scripturas, Lingua vulgari in Templis legunt; ac ita demum populo interpretantur. *Confeſ. Bohemic. Artic.* 10.

III. The Doctrine of the Papiſts concerning publick Religious Worſhip in a known Tongue.

(*t*) Etsi Missa magnam contineat populi fidelis eruditionem : non tamen expedire visum est Patribus, ut vulgari passim lingua celebraretur. *Concil. Trident. Sess.* 22.

(*t*) "Although the Mass containeth much instruction of the People, "yet the Fathers thought it not expedient that it should be every-"where celebrated in the vulgar Tongue.

(*u*) Experientiâ Magistrâ didicimus quid fructus ea res attulerit, quod in pleriſque locis Officia Divina, in linguam vernaculam ad verbum translata decantentur. Tantum abest, ut accesserit ad Pietatem aliquid plus, ut etiam diminutum esse videatur. *Hosius de Sacro vernaculè Legendo.*

(*u*) "Experience teaching us we have learned, what hath been the "fruit of this, that Divine Service in many places Translated into the "Mother-tongue; is said, It is so far that Piety should be encreased, that "it is much diminished thereby.

The *Rhemists* Divines on 1 *Cor.* 14. thus: "We do not doubt but "it is acceptable to God, and available in all necessities, and more a-"greeable to the use of all Christian People ever since their Conversion "to pray in *Latin*, than in the Vulgar, though every one in particular "understandeth not what he saith: So it is plain that such pray with as "great consolation of spirit, with as little tediousness, with as great "devotion and affection, and sometimes more than the other, (such of "their own Church that learn their *Pater-Noster* in their vulgar Tongue) "and always more than any Schismatick or Heretick [Protestants] in "his own Language.---------There is a Reverence and Majesty in the "Churches Tongue dedicated in our Saviours Cross, and giveth more "force and valour to them [Prayers] said in the Churches obedience, "than to others.------The special use of them [Prayers] is to offer our "hearts, desires and wants to God, and to shew that we hang on him "in all things, and this every Catholick doth for his condition, whether "he understand the words of his Prayer or not.------It is enough that "they can tell, this holy Orison to be appointed to us, to call upon God "in all our desires, more than this is not necessary; and the Translati-"on of such holy things often breedeth manifold danger and irreve-"rence in the Vulgar (as to think God is the Author of Sin, when they "read *Lead us not into temptation*) and seldom any edification at all. To "conclude, for praying either publickly or privately in *Latin*, which is "the common Sacred Tongue of the greatest part of the Christian "World, this is thought by the wisest and godliest to be most expedi-"ent, and is certainly seen to be nothing repugnant to St. *Paul.*

Reader, View over again 1 *Cor.* 14. and wonder at this Popish insolence, to say, This is nothing repugnant to St. *Paul.*

IV. *Of the Authority of the Scripture.*

I. The Doctrine of the Apostles concerning the Authority of the Scripture

Scripture, that it doth not depend upon the Teſtimony of Men.

2 Pet. 1. 19. *We have alſo a more ſure word of Propheſie, whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that ſhineth in a dark place.*---- 21. *Holy men of God ſpake as they were moved by the holy Ghoſt.* 2 Tim. 3. 16. *All Scripture is given by inſpiration from God.*------1 Joh. 5. 9. *If we receive the witneſs of men, the witneſs of God is greater.* 1 Theſ. 2. 13. *Ye received the word of God which ye heard of us,*-----*not as the word of men, but as (it is in truth) the word of God.*-----

II. The Doctrine of the Proteſtants, or Reformed Churches concerning the Authority of the Scripture.

(*w*) "The Authority of holy Scripture, for which it ought to be "believed and obeyed, dependeth not upon the Teſtimony of any Man "or Church, but wholly upon God (who is truth it ſelf) the Author "thereof; and therefore it is to be received becauſe it is the Word of "God. (*w*) Aſſemb. Confeſſ.

(*x*) "We believe without wavering all things which are contained "in the Scriptures, not ſo much becauſe the Church alloweth and re- "ceiveth them for Canonical, as for that the Holy Ghoſt beareth wit- "neſs to our Conſciences that they come from God, and have proof "thereof in themſelves. (*x*) Omnia quæ Canonicis libris continentur, abſq; omni dubitatione credimus; idque non tam, quod Eccleſia eos pro hujuſmodi recipiat & approbet, quam imprimis quod Spiritus ſanctus in cordibus noſtris teſtetur à Deo perfectos eſſe, comprobationemq; ejus in ſeipſis habeant. *Confeſſ. Belg. Artic.* 5.

(*y*) "We believe and confeſs that the Canonical Scriptures of the "Prophets and Apoſtles, of Old and New Teſtament, be the true "Word of God, and have ſufficient Authority from themſelves, and "not from men; for God himſelf ſpake unto the Fathers, Prophets "and Apoſtles, and doth yet ſpeak unto us by the holy Scriptures. (*y*) Credimus & confitemur Scripturas Canonicas ſanctorum Prophetarum & Apoſtolorum utriuſq; Teſtamenti ipſum verum eſſe Verbum Dei: & authoritatem ſufficientem ex ſemetipſis, non ex hominibus habere. Nam Deus ipſe loquutus eſt Patribus, Prophetis & Apoſtolis, & loquitur adhuc nobis per Scripturas ſanctas. *Confeſ. Helvet. cap.* 1.

(*z*) "We acknowledg theſe Books to be Canonical, that is, we re- "ceive them as the Rule of our Faith, and that not only from the com- "mon conſent of the Church, but much rather from the Teſtimony and "inward perſwaſion of the holy Spirit.----- (*z*) Hos libros agnoſcimus eſſe Canonicos, id. eſt, ut fidei noſtræ normam & Regulam habemus; idq; non tantum ex communi Eccleſiæ conſenſu, ſed etiam multo magis ex Teſtimonio, & intrinſeca Spiritus ſancti perſuaſione.—— *Confeſſ. Gallic. Art.* 4.

"As we do believe and confeſs that the Word of God doth ſuf- "ficiently inſtruct, and make the man of God perfect. So we do affirm "and freely profeſs, that its Authority is from God, and doth not de-

"pend upon Men or Angels. We therefore assert, that they which say, "The Scripture hath no other Authority, but what it receiveth from "the Church; are Blasphemers against God, and wrong the true "Church, which always heareth and obeyeth the voice of her Bride-"groom and Pastor, but never challengeth to her self a power to be "the Mistress over it. (*a*)

(*a*) Sicut credimus & confitemur Scripturas Dei sufficienter instruere, & hominem Dei perfectum reddere ita; ejus authoritatem à Deo esse, & nec ab homine vel Angelo pendere affirmamus & profitemur. Asserimus itaq; quod qui dicunt Scripturam non aliam habere authoritatem, sed eam quam ab Ecclesia accepit, sunt in Deum blasphemi, & veræ Ecclesiæ injuriam faciunt, quæ semper audit, & voci sponsi & Pastoris sui obsequitur, nunquam autem magistram agere sibi arrogat. *Confess. Scotican. Art.* 19.

(*b*) "Forasmuch as the holy Scriptures were given and inspired by "God himself, [for this cause especially] that they might be understood "of all, they are read in our Churches in the vulgar Tongue.-----

(*b*) Quòd à Deo ipso.—Sacræ Scripturæ traditæ & inspiratæ, Hancq; ob causam potissimùm, ut ab omnibus intelligantur, eas Ecclesiis nostris, lingua vulgari, ——[nostri omnes] Legunt & recitant.——*Confess. Bohemic. Art.* 1.

III. The Doctrine of the Papists concerning the Authority of the Scripture.

(*c*) Cardinal *Hosius* President in the Council of *Trent*, saith, "To "ask, Whether more credit should be given to the Scripture or the "Church? is to ask, Whether more credit should be given to the Holy "Ghost, speaking by the mouth of the Church, or to the Holy Ghost "speaking in the Scripture by the Writings of the Prophets and Apo-"stles.-----The Church is to be believed without the Authority of the "Scriptures.-----If Authority be not granted to the Testimony of the "Church, the Writings of the Evangelists would be of no Authority.

(*c*) Creditum est Ecclesiæ sine omni Scripturarum præsidio. —— Testimonio Ecclesiæ si non sua tribuetur autoritas, nulla erit eorum, quæ Scripta sunt ab Evangelistis autoritas. *Hosius Confess. Fid. Cath. cap.* 15.

Hermanus speaks most contemptuously of the holy Scriptures inspired by the glorious God, saying, "When the Authority of the Church "leaveth the Scriptures, they then are of no more account then *Æsops* "*Fables.*

(*d*) *Pighius* treads in the steps of the rest, concluding, "That all the "Authority which the Scripture hath with us, dependeth of necessity "on the Church.

(*e*) And so doth *Canus* asserting, "That we are not bound to take "the Scriptures for Scripture without the Authority of the Church. "And so do many more, whose sayings we have not room to insert.

(*d*) *Pigh. de Hierar. Lib.* 1. *cap.* 2.

(*e*) *Melch. Canus. loc. com. lib.* 2. *cap.* 8.

V. *Of*

V. *Of the Judg of Controverſies and expounding Scriptures.*

I. The Doctrine of Chriſt and his Apoſtles concerning the Judg of Controverſies and expounding Scriptures.

Mat. 22. 29. *Jeſus anſwered and ſaid unto them* (in the Controverſie about the Reſurrection) *ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God.* 31. *But as touching the Reſurrection of the Dead, have ye not* READ *that which was ſpoken unto you by God, ſaying,* 32. *I am the God of Abraham, &c.* Act. 18. 28. *For he mightily convinced the Jews, and that publickly, ſhewing by the Scriptures that Jeſus was the Chriſt.* Act. 17. 2. *And Paul as his manner was, went in unto them, and three Sabbath-days reaſoned with them out of the Scriptures.* 3. *Opening and alledging that the Chriſt muſt needs have ſuffered, and riſen again from the dead, and that this Jeſus whom I preach unto you is the Chriſt.* See *Acts* 26. 22. & 13. 33.

The Apoſtle teacheth that the Scripture muſt not be expounded according to any private interpretation, 1 *Pet.* 1. 20. and ſuch is any Expoſition that is not according to the Analogy of Faith, which muſt be carefully heeded in Scripture-interpretation, according to the Apoſtles Doctrine. *Rom.* 12. 6.

II. The Doctrine of the Proteſtants and Reformed Churches concerning the Judg of Controverſies and expounding Scripture.

(f) " The Supream Judg by which all Controverſies of Religion " are to be determined, and all Decrees of Councils, opinions of ancient " Writers, Doctrines of Men and private Spirits are to be examined, " and in whoſe ſentence we are to reſt, can be no other but the holy " ſpirit ſpeaking in the Scripture. (f) Aſſemb. Confeſſ.

(g) " We hold no other Judg in matters of Faith than God himſelf, " declaring by the holy Scriptures what is true, and what is falſe, what " ought to be embraced, and what to be avoided. (g) Confeſſ. Helvet. *cap.* 2.

(h) " The Infallible Rule of Interpretation of Scripture is the Scrip- " ture it ſelf, and therefore when there is a Queſtion about the true and " full ſenſe of any Scripture, it muſt be ſearched and known by other " places of Scripture that ſpeak more clearly. (h) Aſſemb. Confeſſ.

(i) " We acknowledg that Interpretation of Scripture only to be " orthodox and genuine, which is fetcht from the Scriptures them- " ſelves. So other Churches in their Confeſſions. (k) (i) Confeſſ. Scotican. Art. 18. de notis Eccleſiæ. (k) Confeſſ. Helvet. cap. 2. Confeſſ. Wittemberg. de ſacra Scriptura, & de Eccleſia.

III. The Doctrine of the Papiſts concerning the Judg of Controverſies and expounding Scripture.

(l) The Council of *Trent* decreed, " That none ſhould interpret the (l) Nemo Sacras Scripturas contra eum ſenſum, quem tenuit, & tenet ſancta mater Eccleſia, cujus eſt judicare de vero ſenſu & interpretatione Scripturarum ſanctarum——interpretari audeat. *Concil. Trid. Seſ.* 4.

"holy

"holy Scripture contrary to the meaning which the holy Mother-"Church, (to whom it doth belong to judg of the true ſence and inter-"pretation of Scripture) hath held and doth hold.-----

(*m*) Corpus jur. Can. Diſt. 19. c. enimvero.

(*m*) "For as much as the holy Church of *Rome*-----is ſet up to the "whole world for a glaſs or example, whatſoever ſhe determineth, or "ordaineth, ought by all perpetually and invincibly to be obſerved. So their Canon Law.

Others of them to the ſame purpoſe: "All power to interpret Scri-"pture, and reveal the hidden Myſteries of our Religion, is given "from Heaven to the Popes and their Councils. We are bound to ſtand "to the judgment of the Pope, rather than to the judgment of all the "World beſides.

"We do conſtantly avouch all the Popes that are rightly elected to "be Chriſts Vicars,-----and to have the higheſt power in the Catholick "Church, and that we are bound to obey him in all things pertaining "to Faith and Religion:------All Catholick men muſt neceſſarily ſubmit "their judgment and opinions, either in expounding the Scripture, or "otherwiſe to the cenſure of the Apoſtolick Seat; and God hath bound "his Church to hear the chief Paſtor in all Points. [Thus *Andradius*, *Alvarus Pelagius*, *Simancha*. *Whites* way to the Church, *p.*37.]

Bellarmine ſticks ſo cloſe to the judgment of the Pope, that he had as good ſay, That if the Pope ſay that black is white, or white black, that darkneſs is light, or that light is darkneſs, we muſt believe it, becauſe his Infallible Holineſs ſaith it, as ſay what he doth in theſe words.

(*n*) To prove the Pope cannot err, he uſeth this *Argument*. Si autem Papa erraret præcipiendo vitio, prohibendo virtutes, teneretur Eccleſia credere vitia eſſe bona, & virtutes malas, niſi vellet contra conſcientiam peccare——ac ne forte contra conſcientiam agat, tenetur credere bonum eſſe quod ille præcipit, malum quod ille prohibet. *Bell. de Pont. lib.*4. *cap.*5.

(*n*) "If the Pope did err commanding Vices and forbidding Virtues, "the Church ſhould be bound to believe, that Vices are good, and "Virtues evil, unleſs ſhe would ſin againſt conſcience.

Is not this a notable ſaying, ſpoken like a Cardinal?

(*o*) *Staplet.* de autorit. Script. lib.2. cap.11. (*p*) Gregor.de valent.Analyſ. fidei,lib.8 c.1. (*q*) Corpus Juris Can. Diſtinct. 40 Si Papa, *&c.*

(*o*) *Stapleton* advancing the judgment of the Church, ſpeaks reſolvedly; "I have ſaid, and do ſay that Scripture in it ſelf is not ſo much "the Rule of Faith, as the Faith of the Church is the Rule of Scripture.

(*p*) And *Gregory* of *Valence* puts in his ſaying for the Popes judgment. "In the *Roman* Biſhop reſideth that full Authority of the Church, when "he pleaſeth to determine matters of Faith, whether he doth it with a "Council, or without.

Yea, the *Canon-Law* ſets him up for ſuch an uncontroulable Judg, "That if the Pope by his negligence or remiſsneſs in his work, (*q*) be "found unprofitable to himſelf or others; or if he ſhould draw with him "innumerable Souls by heaps or troops to hell, yet might no mortal "man be ſo bold or preſumptuous to reprove him, becauſe he is the "Judg of all, to be judged by none.-----

VI. *Of*

VI. *Of the Head of the Universal Church.*

I. The Doctrine of Christ and his Apostles concerning the Head of the Universal Church.

Mat. 23. 8. *But be not ye called Rabbi, for one is your Master even Christ, and all ye are brethren.* Ephes. 1. 22. *And hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the Head over all things to the Church.* 23. *Which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all.* Ephes. 5. 23. *Christ is the head of the Church, and he is the Saviour of the body.* Col. 1. 18. *And he (Christ) is the head of the body, the Church.* 1 Cor. 12. 28. *And God hath set some in the Church, first Apostles, secondarily Prophets, thirdly Teachers, &c.* Ephes. 4. 11. *And he gave some Apostles, and some Pastors and Teachers.*

Reader, observe in these places where the Apostle gives an Enumeration of Church-Officers, here is no mention of a Vicar of Christ, or of any mortal man being the Head under Christ, of all the Churches of Christ in the World, and is it likely that he would have omitted the chiefest and most principal Officer, that is essential to the Church, if there had been any such? I can find several Officers mentioned, but no Universal (though secondary) Head, if I have over-looked him, and thou findest any such, do me the kindness to come, or send, and tell me that thou hast found him in the Apostles Catalogue; which I could not see mentioned neither *expressly*, nor *reductively*; not expressly, that is plain; not reductively, for to which of these should he be reduced? to the Prophets? let me hear his Prophesies, and when any of them have been fulfilled: Besides, I know not that he pretends thereto. To be an Apostle? Apostles went up and down to preach the Gospel, and were not fixed to any particular State, which is not the case of the Bishop of *Rome*. To the number of Teachers, and Pastors? this is below the Pope to be ranked amongst such, for he is the Pastor of Pastors. Besides in the Catalogue there are many Pastors, but I see not one to be the chief and head of all the rest, and of the whole Universal Church. So that in the Catalogue of the Apostle there is no such thing, but is a *non-ens*, a meer *Chimæra*, a fiction.

II. The Doctrine of the Protestants, or Reformed Churches concerning the Head of the Universal Church.

"There is no other Head of the Church, but the Lord Jesus Christ, "nor can the Pope of *Rome* in any sense be Head thereof; all true Pa- "stors in what place soever they be placed, have the same and equal "Authority among themselves, given unto them under Jesus Christ, the "only Head, and the chief, and alone Universal Bishop: And there- "fore it is not lawful for any Church to challenge unto it self, Domi-

"nion

"nion or Soveraignty over any other Church.-----The Bishop of *Rome* "hath no more Jurisdiction over the Church of God, than the rest of "the Patriarchs, either of *Alexandria* or *Antioch* have.

(r) Confess. Helvet. cap. 17. Confess. Scoticana Art. 16. de Ecclesia. Confess. Belgic. Art. 29. Confess. Wittemb. de summo Pontifice. Confess. Bohemic. Art. 8.

To this Doctrine (r) subscribe the Churches of *Helvetia*, *Scotland*, *Belgia*, *Wittemberg*, *Bohemia*, *&c.*

III. The Doctrine of the Papists concerning the Head of the Church.

(s) Corpus, Juris. Can. Decret. part. 2. Q. 7. cap. Beati. distinct. 22. c. Romana Ecclesia cæterarum primatum habet. & glos. distinct. 22. c. Non. & glos. Sacrosancta. Distin. 21. c. quamus. ibid. c. Deniq; distinct. 19. c. enimvero. Distin. 22. c. omnes. Distin. 81. P. Greg. 7. c. si qui.

(s) "The *Canon Law* makes the Church of *Rome* higher than all o- "thers by the Head; affirming the Church of *Rome* to be the Head and "Prince of all Nations; the mother of Faith; that it had this Headship "not from the Apostles but from the Lord himself, and hath the emi- "nency of power over the Universal Church, and the whole flock of "Christian people, the Hinge and Head of all Churches, as the door "doth turn upon the Hinges, so all Churches by Gods appointment (but where I wonder) "are governed by the Authority of this holy "Seat; the first of all other Seats, without spot or blemish, or any such "thing. [Thats a loud one.] The Mistress of all other Churches, a "glass and spectacle unto all men, to be followed in all things she ap- "pointeth. "Against which Church of *Rome* whosoever speaketh any "evil, or endeavours to take away her Priviledg is forthwith an Here- "tick; and whoso shall refuse obedience to the Apostolick Seat, is an "Idolater, a Witch, and Pagan.

Reader, these are high and swelling words, but the best on it, is, it is false Doctrine.

(t) Catechis. Trident. in Expos. Symb. Apost.

(t) The *Roman Catechism* propounds the Question, *What we are to think of the Bishop of Rome?* and answereth, *the account and unanimous opinion of all the Fathers*, (Oh horrible falshood!) *concerning him was, that this visible Head was necessary to the constituting and preserving of the Unity of the Church.*

Reader, thou should know that this is a great cause of division, not of union; for many Churches have separated from them, and continue without communion with them for this, as well as for other Reasons.

(u) Bellarm. de Concil. autorit. lib. 2. cap. 15.

Bellarmine lays down this Assertion; (u) *The Pope is immediately appointed by Christ*, (but I wonder where) *the Pastor and Head, not only of all particular Churches, but also of the whole Universal Church taken together.* But this is their so well known Doctrine by all, that I need quote no more that do assert it.

VII. *Of Infallibility.*

1. The Doctrine of the Apostles concerning the Fallibility of Churches and Pastors. 1 Cor.

1 Cor. 13. 12. *For now we see through a glass darkly.*-----*Now I know but in part.* Gal. 2. 11. *But when I came to Antioch I withstood him* (*Peter*, the Popes pretended Predecessor) *because he was to be blamed*, (and yet his Successor must not be blamed) though through his negligence he should draw many to Hell, as before is shewn.) Ver. 12. *For before that certain came from* James, *he* (Peter) *did eat with the Gentiles; but when they were come, he with-drew, and separated himself, fearing them which were of the Circumcision.* 14. *But when I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the Gospel, I said unto* Peter *before them all, &c.* Reader, from hence thou maist learn that the Successor so called, claimeth a greater Priviledg than his supposed Predecessor had, for *Peter* did err, but the Pope (forsooth) cannot; yet Papists call this Text a rough Scripture, for it so puzleth them that they know not how to answer it, *Rom.* 11. 18, 19, 20, 21. turn to it, *ver.* 22. *Behold therefore the goodness and severity of God; on them* (the Church of the *Jews*) *which fell severity; but towards thee* (the Gentile and Church of *Rome* amongst them) *goodness, if thou continue in his goodness*, (as she hath not); *otherwise thou shalt be cut off.* (Where then is her Infallibility)? *Revel.* 18. 2. *Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen, and is become the habitation of Devils*, (and yet cannot err, no more may Devils), *and the hold of every foul spirit*, (and yet boasts she is without spot) *and a cage of every unclean and hurtful bird*; (and yet is the holy Mother-Church, all this is hard to be reconciled.) Read also the second and third Chapters of the Revelation, what is said of the Seven Churches; and then look for good proof that Infallibility is setled by Christ upon the Church of *Rome*, above all other Churches, before thou believest any such Priviledg to be granted to it.

II. The Doctrine of the Protestants and Reformed Churches concerning the Fallibility of Churches.

(*w*) "As the Church of *Jerusalem*, *Alexandria*, and *Antioch* have "erred; so also the Church of *Rome* hath erred; not only in their living "and manner of Ceremonies, but also in matters of Faith.-----(*x*) When "General Councils are gathered together (forasmuch as they be an As- "sembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and Word "of God) they may err, and sometime have erred, even in things per- "taining unto God.------Hereunto agree many other Churches in their Confessions. (*y*)

III. The Doctrine of the Papists concerning Infallibility of the Church.

(*z*) "They teach that the visible Church whose Rector is the Pope "of *Rome*, never hath erred, never can err.

(*a*) *Bellarmine* affirmeth, "1. That the Pope when he teacheth the "whole Church can in no case err in things appertaining to Faith.

(*w*) Church of Engl. Art. 19.
(*x*) Art. 21.
(*y*) Confes. Helvet. de Eccles. Confes. Saxon. de Eccles. Confes. Wittemberg. de Conciliis.
(*z*) Catechis. Trident. in Expos. Symb. Apost. de Eccles. Q. 15. Test. Rhemist. Annot. on 1 Tim. 1. 15. & Ephes. 5. 24.
(*a*) Bell. de Rom. Pontif. lib. 4. cap. 3

(b) Ibid.lib.4. cap. 4. (c) Ibid.lib.4. cap.5. (d) Ibid.lib.4. cap.6. (e) Idem. de Eccles. milit. lib.3. cap.14. (f) Idem. de Rom. Pont. lib.4. cap.2.

"(b) 2. Not only the Pope of *Rome*, but the particular Church of "*Rome* cannot err in Faith. "(c) 3. The Pope of *Rome* cannot err, "not only in Decrees of Faith, but also not in Precepts of Manners, "which are prescribed to the whole Church, and are necessary to Salva- "tion, or in those things which in themselves are good or evil. "(d) 4. It is probably and piously to be believed, that the Pope not "only as Pope, cannot err, but as a particular person cannot be an He- "retick. (This is a foul mistake, for several Popes have been Heretieks "in the judgments of some of their Popes, so that some of them must "needs err, either some of them in being Hereticks, or others of them "in saying they were, if they were not.) "By pertinaciously believing "any thing that is false, contrary to the Faith. 5. Saith he, (e) "Our "opinion is, That the Church cannot absolutely err, neither in things "absolutely necessary, nor in other things, which she propoundeth to "be believed or done by us, whether they be expresly contained in the "Scriptures, or not.----6. (f) In these two things, all the Catholicks "do agree; 1. That the Pope with his General Council cannot err in "making Decrees of Faith, or general Precepts of Manners. 2. That "the Pope alone, or with his particular Council determining any thing "in a doubtful matter, whether he may err or not, ought to be obeyed "by all the faithful. [A goodly Agreement!]

(g) Catholici tria docent, &c. Becan. Manual. lib.1. cap. 5.

(g) *Becanus* gives the opinion of the Papists, saying, 1. "That the "Church is the Judg of Controversies. 2. That the Rule by which "the Church doth determine Controversies, or give its definitive sen- "tence, is not the Scripture only, but the Scripture and Tradition to- "gether. 3. That the Church according to the Rule (of Scripture and "Tradition) pronounceth sentence either by the Pope, the Pastor of the "Church, or by a Council approved by the Pope, and both ways in- "fallibly.

(h) Pigh. lib. 4. Hier. Eccl. cap. 8.

(h) *Pighius* also puts in his Judgment, "That the Pope cannot any way "be an Heretick, nor publickly teach Heresie, though he alone deter- "mine any matter.

But Reader, notwithstanding all this confidence of Infallibility, whether of Pope, or Councils, or both, they are proved to have erred from the Historical Narratives of their own Writers. *Baronius* acknowledgeth that Pope *Honorius* (i) was counted an Heretick, joyning with the *Monothelites*, or those that denied two Wills in Christ; and by their own *Genebrard* (k); and by the *Rhemists*, though some of them go one way, and some another to salve the Infallibility, yet in vain, when he was condemned by (l) a General Council, and anathematized, with six more holding the same Heresie, and this when the Legats of Pope *Agatho* were present; whose Epistles to *Sergius*, &c. were produced and read in the Council, and judged Heretical, destructive to Mens Souls and condemned to be presently burnt, and so they were.

(i) Spondan. Epitom. Baro. par.2. p.96. (k) Genebr. Chron. lib. 3. pag.484. (l) Concil. Constantinop. 6. act.13. Sur. Tom.2.p.992. Caranz. Sum. Concil. p.591, 610, 612.

Their own *Baronius* also gives an account of the Barbarous actings of

of Pope *Stephen* (*m*) the Seventh, (called the Sixth) towards the dead body of *Formosus* his Predecessor, for taking it out of the Sepulchre, set it clothed in its *Pontificalibus* in the Pontifical seat, and after he had derided it, took off its Vestments, and cut off three fingers, and cast it into the River *Tiber*; and all that *Formosus* had ordained, he degraded and ordained them again. This Pope (saith the Author) gathering a Synod approved his inhumane fact, which was condemned again by Pope *John* the Ninth, as he had made void the Decrees of *Formosus*. And thus they can Decree, and others rescind and decree the contrary, and act worse than Heathens, and yet not err any of them, in Faith or Manners, which to any mans reason seemeth very strange.

(*m*) Ita furore percitus homo non quod jure liceret, sed quod exæstuans rabies suaderet, impulsus. *Spondan. Epitom. Baron. par.* 2. *p.* 247.

(*n*) Besides, *Marcellinus* was an Idolater; (*o*) *Liberius* an *Arrian*; *Siricius*, *Calixtus*, *Leo* the 9, and *Paschalis* condemned Ministers Marriage. *John* the XXII held, That the Souls of the Wicked should not be punished till the day of Judgment. *John* the XXIII. denied the Souls Immortality. *John* the Eleventh kept for his Paramour a famous Strumpet called *Marozia*. *John* the Thirteenth at Dice called to the Devil for help, and drank an Health to him; lay with his own Mother, and his Fathers Concubine; ordained Deacons in a Stable; for Money made Boys Bishops; committed Incest with two of his Sisters; at last being found in the act of Adultery, was slain by the Womans Husband.

(*n*) Ipse Marcellinus ad Sacrificium ductus est, ut Sacrificaret, quod & fecit. *Caranz. Concil. pag.* 72.

(*o*) Liberium tædio victum exilii, in hæreticam pravitatem subscripsisse, asserit Hieronimus: testantur id ipsum alii quoque antiqui Scriptores; ac deniq; Ipse Liberius Scriptis literis ad, &c. *Spondan. Epitom. Baron. in Ann.* 357.

(*p*) Pope *Sylvester* the second was a Conjurer; He enquiring of the Devil how long he should live? was answered, *Till he should say Mass in Jerusalem*; in the *Lent* after as he was saying Mass in the Chappel of Saint *Cross*, he suddenly fell sick, and remembring that that Chappel was called *Jerusalem*, he perceived how he was couzened by the Devil. Before he died, he bequeathed his Soul to the Devil, and commanded his Cardinals, *That after his death they should cut his body in pieces and so bury him.* (*q*) Pope *Hildebrand* was a Conjurer, and enquiring of the Host (which they say is the Body of Christ), for an answer against the Emperour, because it would not speak, *he threw it into the fire and burnt it.* For many Wickednesses he was Deposed and Banished. Pope *Leo* the Tenth, pleased with the great Summs of Money which he had got by Indulgences, said to Cardinal *Bembus*, *See what abundance of wealth we have gotten by this Fable of Christ.* And when he lay upon his death-bed, the same Cardinal rehearsing a Text of Scripture to him, he replied, *Away with these Bables concerning Christ.* Pope *Nicolas* the first

(*p*) *Sylvestrum Secundum, Benedictum* 9. *Gregorium* 6. *Gregorium* 7. *fuisse magos, narrat Beno Cardinalis. Sylvester* 2: *inter ipsas mortis angustias supplicat, manus & linguam sibi abscindi, per quas Sacrificando dæmonibus, Deum inhonoravit.* (*q*) *Hildebrandus, (qui Gregorius* 7.)

Consecratam Eucharistiam in ignem projecit, Consulens Dæmones contra Henricum 4. *Imp. Beno Cardinalis, qui & plura de hoc & aliis Romanis Pontif. miranda narrat, quæ nullus historicorum neq; Platina, nec quisquam alius prodidit. Vide. Illyric. Catal. pag.* 219, 220, 221, 223, &c.

forbade Marriage to the Clergy; saying, *It was more honest to have to do with many Women privately, than openly to take one Wife. John* the XXIV. was accused before the Council of *Constance* for *Heresie, Simony, Murder, Poysonings, Adulteries, and Sodomy*; which being made good against him he was Deposed and Imprisoned. (r) Pope *Eugenius* the Fourth was Deposed by the General Council at *Basil*, for *being a Simonist, and guilty of Perjury, being a Schismatick, and an obstinate Heretick.* It would make a large Book to give an account of the failings of Popes in matters both of Life and Faith; but I have but little room allowed. Take two general Expressions of their own Authors, and then judg. (s) *What then was the face of the holy Roman Church? How exceeding filthy, when the most potent, and yet the most sordid Whores did rule at Rome?------and their Lovers thrust in* Peter's *Chair?* (t) Another fixt enough to the Popish Religion, acknowledged that *in this one thing that age was unhappy, that for near one hundred and fifty years about fifty Popes did wholly fall away from the virtue of their Ancestors, being rather Apotactical* [irregular] *and Apostatical than Apostolical.*

(r) Laurent. Suri. Concil. Tom. 4. pag. 104.

(s) Vide. Luitprand. lib. 2. c. 13. & Baron. Annal. ad An. 912. vel Spondan. — Ex quibus videas fœdissimam hujus temporis Ecclesiæ Romanæ faciem, — ad An. 912.

And as the Church (if thereby understood the Pope) hath failed, so also if taken for General Councils hath also failed, as is plain by this Infallible Argument, in that several General Councils ratified by Popes have decreed things contradictory, and that in matters of Faith; and some of them must necessarily err, except contradictions can be reconciled, and both parts be true, which is impossible. For example, the General Council of *Constance* and of *Basil* have fully asserted that a General Council is above the Pope, and is to be judged by them, and by them may be deposed; in these words; *Not one of the skilful did ever doubt but that the Pope was subject to the judgment of a General Council, in things that concern Faith; and that he cannot without their consent dissolve or remove a General Council, yea and that this is an article of Faith, which without destruction of Salvation cannot be denied, and that the Council is above the Pope,* de fide, *and that it cannot be removed without their own consent, and that he is an Heretick that is against these things.* Thus the Council of *Basil*, owned by Pope *Eugenius*. And the Council of *Constance* (u) confirmed by Pope *Martin* the Fifth, being personally present in it. And yet another General Council at the (w) *Lateran* under *Julius* the second, and *Leo* the tenth, expressly decree on the contrary that

(t) Genebrar. in Seculum decimum. Infælix dicitur hoc seculum, exhaustum hominibus ingenio & Doctrina claris sive etiam claris principibus & Pontificibus, in quo nihil fere dignum memoria posteritatis gestum sit. Hoc ipso infelicissimum, quod Ecclesia esset, — sine ullo bono fere Pontifice. — Hoc vero uno infælix, quod per annos fere 150, Pontifices circiter 50, à Johanne scilicet 8, qui Nicolao, & Adriano 2, sanctis successit, ad Leonem 9, usq; à virtute majorum prorsus defecerint, Apotactici, Apostaticivè potius quam Apostolici, è tanto Pontificum numero, quinq; modo, & satis tenuiter, laudantur, &c. *Genebrard. Chronol. lib* 4. *pag.* 552, 553.

(u) Primo definitur quod generalis Synodus in spiritu sancto legitime congregata, generale Concilium faciens, Ecclesiam militantem repræsentans, potestatem à Christo immediatè habet, cui quilibet cujuscunque status, etiamsi Papalis existat, obedire tenetur in his quæ pertinent ad fidem & ad extirpationem schismatum, & ad generalem reformationem Ecclesiæ in capite & in membris. Secundò, declarat quod quicunq; cujuscunq; dignitatis, & etiamsi Papalis existat, qui mandatis aut præceptis hujus sanctæ Synodi, & cujuscunq; alterius Concilii generalis: ——Obedire contumaciter contempserit, nisi resipuerit, condignæ pœnitentiæ subjiciatur & debite puniatur. Tertiò, declarat quod

quod ipsum generale Concilium pro præmissis, eaque concernentibus Congregatum sine ipsius consensu, per nullum, quavis autoritate, etiamsi Papali dignitate præfulgent, dissolvi, transferri, aut ad aliud tempus prorogari potest.——Hæc tria sunt veritates fidei Catholicæ,——quibus pertinaciter repugnans est censendus hæreticus: (*w*) Cum etiam solum Romanum Pontificem, pro tempore existentem, tanquam authoritatem super omnia concilia habentem, conciliorum indicendorum, transferendorum, ac dissolvendorum plenum jus & potestatem habere, ex — Conciliorum confessione manifeste constet: *Laurent. Surius, Concil. Tom.* 4. *pag.*683. There was but one in all the Council, but gave his *placet* hereunto, that would not recede from the determination of the Council of *Basil: Ibid. pag.* 684.

the Pope is above a General Council; till these two can be true, both of them, the Pope is above a General Council, and the Pope is not above a General Council, the Infallibility of their Church (and that even in a fundamental Point thereof) is laid in the dust. Let them chuse which side they will, one did err.

VIII. *Of the Catholick Church.*

I. The Doctrine of the Apostles concerning the Catholick or Universal Church.

1 Cor. 1. 2. *Unto the Church of God which is at* Corinth,------*with all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours.* 1 Cor. 12. 13. *For by one spirit, we are all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free, and have been all made drink into one spirit.* Rev. 7. 9. *After this I beheld, and lo a great multitude which no man could number, of all Nations and kindreds, and people, and tongues, stood before the Throne, and before the Lamb.*------See also *Ephes.* 1. 10, 22. *Act.* 2. 39. *Ephes.* 2. 19. & 3. 15. *Act.* 2. 47. *Mat.* 28. 19. *Mar.* 16. 15. *Act.* 2. 21. *Rom.* 1. 16. *Gal.* 3. 28. *Act.* 13. 39. *Rom.* 10. 4. *Luk.* 13. 28. *Act.* 10. 35.

Reader, observe that these Scriptures speak of the Church, under Christ the Head thereof, (making no mention of owning of, or being joyned to, any mortal man, as their visible Head) in which Church, (not limited or confined to the Church of *Rome*) there is Salvation.

II. The Doctrine of the Protestants concerning the Catholick or Universal Church.

"The Catholick or Universal Church which is invisible, consists of "the whole number of the Elect that have been, are, or shall be ga- "thered into one, under Christ the Head thereof, and is the Spouse, the "Body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all.

"The visible Church which is also Catholick or Universal under the "Gospel, (not confined to one Nation, as before under the Law) "consists of all those throughout the World, that profess the true Re- "ligion, together with their Children, and is the Kingdom of the "Lord Jesus, the House and Family of God, out of which there is no "ordinary possibility of Salvation.

(*x*) Conf. Gall. art. 27, 28: Conf. Helvet. 2. cap. 17: Bohem. c. 8: Belg. art. 27: Wittemb. art. 32.

(*x*) This is the Confession also of the Churches of *Helvetia*, *Bohemia*, *Belgia*, *Wittemberg*, *&c.*

III. The

III. The Doctrine of the Papists concerning the Catholick or Universal Church.

(y) Catechis. Rom. in Symb. pag. 139, 141. (z) Concil. Lateran. abrogat. pray. Mat. sanct. Bull: (a) Ad fontem veri perveni. —— Quem sancti doctores, —— quorum una vox est, salvari non posse, qui sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ non tenet unitatem; omnesq; illas virtutes mancas esse ei, qui summo Pontifici obedire recusat; quamvis in sacco & cinere jacens, dies & noctes jejunet, & oret, & in cæteris videatur legem implere, —— didicimus unam Ecclesiam Catholicam & Apostolicam (subaud. Romanam) esse matrem omnium fidelium, extra quam non invenitur salus. —— *Pius* 2. Bul. Retractationum apud *Laurent. Surium, Concil. Tom.* 4. *pag.* 506.

(y) The *Trent* Catechism maketh that the only Church that is under the Pope, excluding all others that submit not to him as the Vicar of Christ; the same in a General Council made it necessary to Salvation, (z) to be subject to the Pope of *Rome*; by *Leo* the tenth: Pope *Pius* the second approved this Doctrine; ["I came (a) to the fountain of "Truth, which the holy Doctors,----with one voice say, That he can- "not be saved that holdeth not the Unity of the holy Church of *Rome*; "and that all those virtues are maimed to him that refuseth to obey "the Pope of *Rome*, though he lie in sackcloth and ashes, and fast and "pray both day and night, and seem in other things to fulfil the Law "of God.----We learned that the one Catholick and Apostolical Church "(of *Rome*) is the Mother of all the Faithful, out of which there is no "Salvation.-----

But Reader, dost thou think that God will damn any holy, humble and believing persons, because they are not subject to the Pope? hath God any where made such subjection to him a condition of Salvation? let them shew it if they can. Or are there no such persons in the World that are holy and believing, that do not submit unto the Pope? There are many thousands that know themselves better than his Infallible Holiness can know them, that know that to be a falshood.

(b) Bellar. de Eccles. Milit. lib. 3. cap. 2.

Neither doth *Bellarmine* vary from them in his definition of the Church; (b) "That it is a company of men knit together in the pro- "fession of the same Christian Faith, and communion of the same Sa- "craments, under the Government of lawful Pastors, especially of the "Bishop of *Rome*, Christs Vicar upon Earth. From whence it might be "easily gathered (saith he) who do belong to the Church, and who "do not. There are three parts (as he goeth on) of this definition of "the Church. 1. Profession of the true Faith. 2. Communion of "the Sacraments. 3. Subjection to the Pope of *Rome* the lawful Pa- "stor. By the first all Infidels, Turks, Pagans, Hereticks and Apostates "are excluded from the Church. By the second, Catechumens and Ex- "communicated persons be excluded. By the third, all Schismaticks "that have the Word and Sacraments, but do not submit to the law- "ful Pastor, (the Pope); but all others though they be Reprobates, "wicked and ungodly are included in the Church.

Mark this, good Reader, whether this sounds like the Apostles Doctrine before laid down, if men be never so good, and holy, though con-

converted, and believe, if they do not submit to the Pope as the Universal Head, they are no Members of Christs Church, nor can be saved; and if they be wicked and ungodly, if they own the Pope they are included in the Church. Oh what an odious Religion is that, which damns all the Christians in the world besides themselves! O what wretched dissembling is this, to call their Church the most holy Church without spot or wrinkle or any such thing; when the worst might be and are owned as Members thereof, if they profess subjection to the Pope! but however by this the Head and Members are conformable, and let them go together.-----

IX. *Of Justification.*

I. The Doctrine of the Apostles concerning Justification.

Rom. 4. 5. *Now to him that worketh not, but believeth on him, that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness.* 6. *Even as* David *describeth the blessedness of the man unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works.* 7. *Saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered.* 8. *Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin.* 2 Cor. 5. 19. *Not imputing their trespasses unto them.* 21. *For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.* Rom. 3. 22. *Even the righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ, unto all, and upon all that do believe.* 24. *Being justified freely by his grace, through the Redemption that is in Christ Jesus.* See *ver.* 25, 28. and *Tit.* 3. 5, 7. *Rom.* 5. 17, 18, 19. *Gal.* 2. 16. *Phil.* 3. 9. *Act.* 13. 38, 39. *Ephes.* 2. 8, 9.

II. The Doctrine of the Protestants concerning Justification.

"We are accounted righteous before God, only for the Merit of our "Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by Faith, and not for our own works "and deservings.

"Those whom God effectually calleth, he also freely justifieth; not "by infusing righteousness into them, but by pardoning their sins, and "by accounting and accepting their persons as righteous; not for any "thing wrought in them, or done by them, but for Christs sake alone. "Imputing the Obedience and Satisfaction of Christ unto them, they "receiving and resting on Him, and his Righteousness by Faith, which "Faith they have, not of themselves, it is the gift of God.

To this Doctrine consent the (*c*) Reformed Churches in *Helvetia, Bohemia, France, Belgia*, &c.

III. The Doctrine of the Papists concerning Justification.

"(*d*) Justification is not only the forgiveness of sin, but also the

(*c*) Confess. Helvet. 1. 4. 16. & 2. cap. 15. Bohemic. cap. 6, 7. Gallart. 12. 22. August. art. 4. 6. 26. Belg. art. 22, 24. Wittemberg. art. 5. Basil art. 8.

(*d*) Justificatio non est sola peccatorum remissio, sed &

Sanctificatio. & renovatio interioris hominis per voluntariam susceptionem gratiæ & donorum, *&c.* unica formalis causa ejus est justitia Dei, *&c.* qua videlicet, ab eo donati, renovamur spiritu mentis nostræ, *&c.* Si quis dixerit homines justificari vel sola imputatione justitiæ Christi, vel sola peccatorum remissione, exclusa gratia, & charitate, quæ in cordibus eorum per Spiritum sanctum diffundatur, atq; illis inhæreat, aut etiam gratiam qua justificamur, esse tantum favorem Dei, anathema sit. *Concil. Trident. Sess. 6.* Sancti-

"Sanctification and Renovation of the inward man by a voluntary sus-
"ception of grace and gifts, whereby a man of unjust is made just, and
"of an enemy is made a friend, that he might be an heir according to
"the hope of eternal life.-----The only formal cause of Justification is
"the Righteousness of God, not wherewith he himself is righteous, but
"whereby he makes us righteous; namely, by which, being given to
"us by him, we are renewed in the spirit of our mind, and not only
"reputed, but are, and are truly called righteous, receiving Righteous-
"ness in our selves, every one according to his measure, which the
"holy Spirit imparteth to each, as he will, according to every ones
"own disposition, and co-working.-----If any one shall say that a man
"is justified by the sole Imputation of the Righteousness of Christ, or in
"the sole remission of Sin, excluding Grace and Charity, which is shed
"abroad in their hearts by the holy Spirit, and is inherent in him, or
"that the Grace whereby we are justified is only the favour of God, let
"him be accursed:

Reader, by this Council thou maist see, how the Papists do confound Justification, and Sanctification together, and place it in our inherent Righteousness; though these are not separated, that any should be justified that are not sanctified, penitent, and believing, yet they are carefully to be distinguished.

X. *Of Merit of good Works.*

I. The Doctrine of Prophets, Christ, and his Apostles.

Isa. 64. 6. *All our righteousnesses are as filthy rags.* Job 22. 2. *Can a man be profitable unto God? 3. Is it any gain to him that thou makest thy way perfect?* Job 35. 7. *If thou be righteous what givest thou unto him? or what receiveth he of thy hand?* Luk. 17. 10. *We are unprofitable servants, we have done that which was our duty to do.* Rom. 8. 18. *For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in us.* Also *Psal.* 130. 3. & 143. 2. *Rom.* 4. 2, 4, 5, 6. 1 *Cor.* 4. 7. *Eph.* 2. 9.

II. The Doctrine of the Protestants.

(e) Confess. Wittemb. de bonis operibus. Bohem. art. 7. Saxon. art. 3. & 8. August. art. 4. & 20. Helvet. 2. c. 16. Belg. art. 24. Argentinens. cap. 10.

"We cannot by our best Works merit pardon of Sin, or Eternal Life
"at the hand of God, by reason of the great disproportion that is be-
"tween them and the Glory to come, and the infinite distance that there
"is between us and God, whom by them we can neither profit, nor satis-
"fie for the debt of our former sins, but when we have done all we
"can, we have done but our duty, and are unprofitable servants; and
"because as good they proceed from his Spirit, yet as they are wrought
"by us, they are defiled and mixed with so much weakness and imper-
"fection, that they cannot endure the severity of Gods judgment. To
this Doctrine the Reformed Churches do subscribe. (e)

III. The Doctrine of the Papists.

"If any one shall say, That the good Works of a justified person are
"so

" ſo the gifts of God, that they may not alſo be the good Merits of him " that is juſtified, or that he that is juſtified, doth not by the good works " which he doth, by the Grace of God and Merit of Chriſt (of whom he " is a living Member) truly merit increaſe of grace, eternal life, and (if " he depart in a ſtate of Grace) the enjoyment thereof, and moreover alſo " increaſe of Glory, let him be accurſed. *(f)*

(f) Si quis dixerit hominis juſtificati bona opera ita eſſe dona Dei, ut non ſint etiam bona ipſius juſtificati merita, aut ipſum juſtificatum bonis operibus, *&c.* non vere mereri augmentum gratiæ, vitam æternam & ipſius vitæ æternæ, *&c.* conſecutionem, atq; etiam gloriæ augmentum, anathema ſit. *Concil. Trid. Seſſ. 6.*

" Mens works proceeding from Grace deſerve or merit Heaven.----- " If the joy of Heaven be retribution, repayment, hire-wages for " works, then works can be no other but the value, deſert, price, " worth and merit of the ſame.-----The word Reward in *Latin* or *Greek* " is the very ſtipend that the hired Workman *(g)* or Journey-man " covenanteth to have of him, whoſe work he doth, and is a thing e- " qually and juſtly anſwering to the time and weight of his travels and " works,------rather than a free-gift, *&c.* *(h)* it is moſt clear to all not " blinded in pride and contention, that good Works are meritorious, and " the very cauſe of Salvation.

(g) Rhemiſts on 1 Cor. 3.8.

(h) Rhem. on Heb. 6. 10.

(i) The Heavenly Bleſſedneſs which the Scripture calls the Reward " of the Juſt, is not given of God *gratis* and freely, but is due to their " Works.-------Yea God hath ſet forth Heaven to ſale for our Works. " *(k)* Far be it from us that the righteous ſhould look for eternal life, " as a poor man doth for his alms, for it is much more honour for them " as victors and triumphers to poſſeſs it, as the garland which by their " labour they have deſerved. *(l)* Although the reſtauration of Mankind " be aſcribed to the Merits of Chriſt, yet it is not for Chriſts Merits " that our Works are rewarded with eternal life; neither doth God, " when he gives the Reward, look towards Chriſts death, but only to the " firſt inſtitution of Mankind, wherein by the Law of nature it was " appointed that in the juſt judgment of God, obedience ſhould be re- " warded with life, as diſobedience is with death.

(i) Andrad. orth. expl. l. 6.

(k) Dean of Lovan Expli. art. Lovan. Tom. 2. art. 9.

(l) Bayus de Merit. operum lib. 1. c. 9.

(m) " A ſupernatural Work proceeding from Grace, within it ſelf, " and of its own nature, hath a proportion and condignity with the " Reward, and a ſufficient value to be worth the ſame. The Reward there- " fore is not given for Chriſts Merit,-----It muſt not be denied but our " Merits are true Merits, ſo that the Works of the godly proceeding " from Grace, have of themſelves an inward worthineſs, and are pro- " portionable to the Reward, *&c.*

(m) Suarez. Tom. 1. in Tho. 3. d. 41. Sect. 3. ſi. ſecundo, & oportet.

The Papiſts in this Point are not all of a mind, but many of them ſwell with horrible pride, and think themſelves do deſerve Heaven as well as a Journey-man doth his Wages, and cannot be brought to ſtoop ſo low, as to receive the higheſt happineſs as the free gift of God.

XI. *Of Works of Supererogation.*

I. The Doctrine of the Scripture.

Nehem. 13. 22. *And I commanded the Levites that they ſhould cleanſe themſelves.-----Remember me O my God, concerning this alſo, and ſpare me according to the greatneſs of thy mercies.* Luk. 17. 10. Gal. 5. 17.

II. The Doctrine of the Proteſtants.

"Voluntary Works, beſides, over and above Gods Commandments, "which they call Works of Supererogation, cannot be taught with- "out arrogancy and impiety; for by them men do declare that they do "not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that "they do more for his ſake, than of bounden duty is required, whereas "Chriſt ſaith plainly, *When ye have done all that are commanded you, ſay we are unprofitable ſervants.*

(n) Confeſſ. Helvet. 2. c. 16. Auguſt. art. 20. Gal. art. 24. Sax. art. 3. 17. Baſil. art. 10. Belg. art. 12.

Againſt ſuch Works are the Reformed (n) Churches alſo in *Helvetia, France, Saxony, &c.*

III. The Doctrine of the Papiſts.

(o) Rhemiſts on 2 Cor. 8. 14.

"(o) The faſtings and ſatisfactory deeds of one man, be available "to others; yea, and holy Saints, and other vertuous perſons may in "meaſure and proportion of other mens neceſſities and deſervings allot "unto them, as well the Supererogation of their Spiritual Works, as "thoſe that do abound in worldly goods may give Alms of their Su- "perfluities, to them which are in neceſſity. Again, they expound 1 *Cor.* 9. 16. "But now preaching not only as enjoined me, but alſo "as of Love and Charity, and freely without putting any man to coſt, "and that voluntarily and of very deſire to ſave my Hearers, I ſhall have "my reward of God, yea, and a reward of Supererogation, which is "given to them that of abundant Charity do more in the ſervice of God "than they be commanded.

But Reader, though a man might have more Money than he doth need, yet thou ſhalt not find a man that hath more Grace than he doth need, and he that cannot ſatisfie for himſelf cannot impart ſatisfaction to another; for none can give what they have not; and if we do what is no way commanded, we might hear, Who hath required this at your hands? and though *Paul* was not burdenſome to the *Corinthians*, yet he received from other Churches to do them ſervice. So that all that is ſaid falls ſhort to prove Works of Supererogation: Let proud Papiſts boaſt of doing more, while thou goeſt to thy knees to lament, that when thou haſt done thy moſt and beſt, haſt done leſs than is commanded.

XII. *Of Religious Worſhip.*

I. The Doctrine of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, that Religious Worſhip is due only to God.

Mat. 4. 10. *Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve.* Col. 2. 18. *Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility*

humility and worshipping of Angels. Rev. 19. 10. *And I fell at his feet to worship him, and he said unto me, See thou do it not; I am thy fellow-servant,----worship God.* See also Rev. 22. 8, 9. Act. 10. 25. *As* Peter *was coming in,* Cornelius *met him and fell down at his feet and worshipped him.* 26. *But* Peter *took him up, saying, stand up, I my self also am a man.* Read also *Act.* 14. 13, 14, 15, 18. *Rom.* 10. 14.

II. The Doctrine of the Protestants.

"(p) Religious Worship is to be given to God, the Father, Son, and "Holy Ghost, and to him alone, and not to Angels, Saints, or any o- "ther creature.-----The acceptable way of Worshipping the true God, "is instituted by himself, and so limited to his own revealed Will, that "he may not be Worshipped according to the imaginations and devices "of men, or the suggestions of Satan, under any visible representati- "ons, or any other way not prescribed in the holy Scripture. In this the Reformed Churches do agree in their publick Confessions.

(p) Confess. Helvet. c. 4, 5. Gall. art. 24. Belgic. art. 26. Argent c. 11. August. art. 21 Saxon. de Invocation. &c.

III. The Doctrine of the Papists concerning Religious Worship given to Saints, and their Reliques, and to Images.

(q) "The holy Synod of *Trent* doth command all Bishops and o- "thers that have the office and care of teaching, that according to the "use of the Catholick and Apostolical Church (that is false,) received "from the Primitive times of the Christian Religion, and according to "the consent of the holy Fathers, (this is false too,) and Decrees of "sacred Councils, (which yet have decreed against it.) that they first "of all diligently instruct the faithful concerning the Intercession and "Invocation of Saints, the honour of Reliques, and the lawful use of "Images, teaching them that the Saints reigning together with Christ, "do offer their Prayers to God for men, and that it is good and pro- "fitable, humbly kneeling to call upon them; and to run to their "Prayers, help and aid, for the benefits to be obtained from God "through his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, who is our only Redeemer and

(q) Mandat sancta Synodus omnibus Episcopis, & cæteris docendi munus curamq; sustinentibus, ut juxta Catholicæ & Apostolicæ Ecclesiæ usum, à primævis Christianæ Religionis temporibus receptum, Sanctorumq; patrum consensionem & sacrorum Conciliorum decreta, imprimis de Sanctorum Intercessione, Invocatione, Reliquiarum honore & legitimo Imaginum usu, fideles diligenter instruant, docentes eos, Sanctos una cum Christo regnantes, orationes suas pro hominibus Deo offerre, bonum atque utile esse simpliciter eos invocare, & ob beneficia impetranda à Deo per filium ejus, &c. ad eorum orationes, opem, auxiliumq; confugere; illos vero qui negant sanctos æterna fælicitate in cœlo fruentes, invocandos esse, aut qui asserunt, vel illos pro hominibus non orare, vel eorum, ut pro nobis etiam singulis orent, Invocationem esse Idololatriam, vel pugnare cum verbo Dei, adversariq; honori unius Mediatoris Dei, & hominum Jesu Christi, vel stultum esse, in cœlo regnantibus voce, vel mente supplicare, impie sentire: Sanctorum quoq; Martyrum, & aliorum cum Christo viventium sancta corpora quæ viva membra Christi fuerint, & templum Spiritus sancti, ab ipso ad æternam vitam suscitanda, & glorificanda, à fidelibus veneranda esse, per quæ multa beneficia à Deo hominibus præstantur; ita ut affirmantes sanctorum Reliquiis venerationem atq; honorem non deberi, vel eas, aliaq; sacra monumenta à fidelibus inutiliter honorari, atq; eorum opis impetrandæ causa sanctorum memorias frustra frequentari, damnandos esse, prout jampridem eos damnavit, & nunc etiam damnat Ecclesia. Imagines porro, Christi, Deiparæ Virginis & aliorum Sanctorum, in templis præsertim habendas & retinendas, eisque debitum honorem & venerationem impertiendam. *Concil. Trident. Sess.* 25.

"Saviour; and that they are of a wicked opinion that say, that the "Saints enjoying eternal happiness in Heaven are not to be called upon; or who do affirm, either that they do not pray for men, or that "to pray to them, that they would pray for us, yea each one particularly, is Idolatry, or contrary to the Word of God, or against the honour of Jesus, the one Mediator of God and Men; or that it is "a foolish thing to make humble request in words, or in our "minds to those that are reigning in Heaven. Moreover, "that the sacred bodies of the holy Martyrs and others "living with Christ, which were living Members of Christ, and the "Temple of the Holy Ghost, which shall be raised by him to eternal life "and be glorified, are to be worshipped by Believers, by which God "bestoweth many benefits on men. So that whosoever shall say, that "Veneration and Honour is not due to the Reliques of the Saints, or "that these and other sacred Monuments are without profit honoured [worshipped] by the faithful; and that for the gaining of their "help the memory of Saints in vain is solemnized, are utterly to be "condemned, even as the Church hath long condemned them, and "doth now condemn them. Moreover, the Images of Christ, the Virgin *Mary*, and of other Saints are especially to be had and kept in "Churches, and due honour and Veneration to be given to them.

Again, "It is beyond all doubt, that Believers according to the "custom always received in the Catholick Church should give to the "holy Sacrament, the Worship of *Latria*, (Highest Worship) which is "due to the true God. *Concil. Trident. Sess.* 13. *cap.* 5.

The Popish Doctors maintain of Images in general, that they ought to be worshipped with the same Adoration as the thing represented by the Image. So *Aquinas*. The same reverence is given to the Image of Christ as to Christ himself. Since therefore Christ is worshipped with Adoration of *Latria* (Highest Worship due to God) it follows that his Image ought to be worshipped with Adoration of *Latria* (or Highest Worship due to God.)

XIII. *Of Transubstantiation.*

I. The Doctrine of Christ and his Apostles, that after Consecration in the Lords Supper there is real Bread and Wine.

Mat. 26. 26, 27. *Luk.* 22. 19, 20. 1 *Cor.* 11. 23. *The Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed took bread.* 24. *And when he had given thanks-----he took the cup-----saying, This cup is the New Testament in my Blood.* Mark Reader, after the blessing it is called Bread. 26. *As often as ye eat this bread, drink this cup.* 27. *Whosoever shall eat this bread.* 28. *Examine-----and eat of that bread.* 1 Cor. 10. 16. *The bread which we break is it not the communion of the body of Christ.* Act. 20. 7. *They came together to break bread.* 11. *And had broken bread.*-----

II. The Doctrine of the Protestants.

"Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of Bread and "Wine) in the Supper of the Lord cannot be proved by holy writ; but

"but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the "nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasions to many Superstiti- "ons,-----and Idolatries, and is repugnant to very sense and reason. Which reasons have moved all the Reformed Churches against the Doctrine of Transubstantion. *(r)*

(r) Conf. Helv. 1. art. 22. & 2. c. 21. Wittem. c. 19. de Euchar. Basil. art. 6. Scotican. art. 21.

III. The Doctrine of the Papists.

(s) "If any shall deny the Body and Blood, together with the Soul "and Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and so whole Christ to be "truly, really and substantially contained in the most holy Sacrament "of the Eucharist (Lords Supper) but shall say, it is there only as in a "sign, either figuratively or virtually, let him be accursed. If any "shall say, that the substance of Bread and Wine together with the Body "and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, doth remain in the Sacrament of "the holy Eucharist, and shall deny that wonderful and singular con- "version of the whole substance of the Bread into his Body, and of "the whole substance of the Wine into his Blood (the figures of Bread "and Wine only remaining) which Conversion [change] the Catholick "Church doth most fitly call Transubstantiation, let him be accursed.

(s) Si quis negaverit, in sanctissimæ Eucharistiæ Sacramento contineri; verè, realiter, & substantialiter corpus & sanguinem, unà cum anima & divinitate Christi, *&c.* Si quis dixerit in Sacrasancto Eucharistiæ Sacramento remanere substantiam panis & vini, *&c.* negaveritq; mirabilem illam & singularem conversionem totius substantiæ panis in corpus, & totius substantiæ vini in sanguinem, &c. *Concil. Trident. Sess.* 13. *Can.* 1, 2.

XIV. *Of Receiving both kinds.*

I. The Doctrine of Christ and his Apostles, that those that have the Bread should also have the Cup.

Mark 14. 22, 23, 24. Luk. 22. 19, 20. 1 Cor. 10. 16. & 11. 24. *Take, eat,*-----25.-----*as oft as ye drink it.*-----26. *eat this bread, and drink this cup*----27. *shall eat this bread and drink this cup,*---*so let him eat*-----*and drink of this cup.* 29. *for he that eateth and drinketh.*-----

II. The Doctrine of the Protestants.

"The cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the Lay-people, for "both the parts of the Lords Sacrament, by Christs Ordinance and "Commandment, ought to be ministred to all Christian men alike. That "the People are to receive the Wine also, is the Confession of Reformed Churches in *Helvetia*, *Bohemia*, *France*, *&c.* *(t)*

(t) Confes. Helv. 1. art. 22. & 2. c. 21. Bohem. c. 13. Gall. 36, 38. Wittemb. cap. 19. Belg. art. 35. Saxon. de cœna Domini. August. de missa, art. 1, 2.

III. The Doctrine of the Papists.

The Council of *Constance* decreed, "*(u)* That though Christ admini- "stred this Sacrament in both kinds to his Disciples, and in the Primi- "tive Church it was also accordingly received by Believers under both "kinds [Bread and Wine,] *hoc tamen non obstante*, (notwithstanding "Christs Institution, and the example of the Primitive Church) the "Lay-people shall have the bread only. Others that pertinaciously "affirm otherwise are to be expelled as Hereticks. Also we command "upon pain of Excommunication that no Presbyter administer it to "the people under both kinds of Bread and Wine. The *Council of*

(u) Concil. Constant. Sess. 13.

Trent

(w) Concil. Trident. Seſſ. 21 cap. 1, 2, 3.

Trent to the ſame purpoſe did decree, The taking away the Cup from the People, *(w)* notwithſtanding Chriſts Inſtitution, and adminiſtration of it in both kinds, "having a power to alter and change, ſo "that they keep the ſubſtance of the Sacrament, as they judg moſt pro- "fitable for the receivers; and though they confeſs the Primitive "Church received both, yet the Church of *Rome* for grand and juſt "reaſons hath approved and decreed the Peoples taking of it in one "kind only.

XV. *Of the Sacrifice of the Maſs.*

I. The Doctrine of the Apoſtle *Paul.*

Heb. 9. 22. *And almoſt all things are by the Law purged with blood, and without ſhedding of blood there is no remiſſion.* 25. *Nor yet that he ſhould offer himſelf often, as the high Prieſt entreth into the holy place every year with the blood of others.* 26. *(For then muſt he have often ſuffered ſince the foundation of the world) but now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away ſins by the ſacrifice of himſelf.* 28. *So Chriſt was once offered to bear the ſins of many.*------Heb. 10. 11. *And every Prieſt ſtandeth daily miniſtring and offering oftentimes the ſame ſacrifices, which can never take away ſins.* 12. *But this man after he had offered one ſacrifice for ſins, for ever ſate down on the right hand of God.* 14. *For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are ſanctified.* 18. *Now where remiſſion of theſe is, there is no more offering for ſin:* Read alſo *Heb.* 7.23,24,25,26,27.

II. The Doctrine of the Proteſtants.

Confeſ. Helvet. 1. art. 22. & 2. cap. 20, 21. Baſil. art. 6. Saxon. art. 14. Belg. art. 35. Wittemb. c. 19 Bohem. c. 13. Auguſtan. de Miſſa, art. 13.

"The offering of Chriſt once made, is that perfect Redemption, Pro- "pitiation, and Satisfaction for all the ſins of the whole World, both "original and actual, and there is no other ſatisfaction for ſin, but that "alone. Wherefore the Sacrifices of Maſſes, in the which it was com- "monly ſaid that the Prieſt did offer Chriſt for the quick and dead, to "have remiſſion of pain or guilt, were blaſphemous fables, and dan- "gerous deceits. This is the Doctrine of all Reformed Churches a- "gainſt the ſacrifice of the Maſs. *(x)*

III. The Doctrine of the Papiſts.

(q) Si quis dixerit, in Miſſa non offerri Deo verum & proprium ſacrificium,——

(y) "If any ſhall ſay that in the Maſs a true and proper ſacrifice is "not offered to God, let him be accurſed. If any ſhall ſay in thoſe "words (do this in remembrance of me) Chriſt did not inſtitute his "Apoſtles to be Prieſts, or that he did not ordain, that they and other "Prieſts ſhould offer his body and blood, let him be accurſed.

Anathema ſit. Si quis dixerit, illis verbis, hoc facite in meam Commemorationem, Chriſtum non inſtituiſſe Apoſtolos ſacerdotes; aut non ordinaſſe, ut, ipſi aliiq; ſacerdotes offerrent corpus & ſanguinem ſuum, Anathema ſit. Si quis dixerit, Miſſæ ſacrificium tantum eſſe laudis & gratiarum actionis, *&c.* non autem propitiatorium; vel ſoli prodeſſe ſumenti, neq; pro vivis & defunctis, pro peccatis, pœnis, ſatisfactionibus, & aliis neceſſitatibus offerri debere, anathema ſit. *Concil. Trident. Seſſ. 22. de Sacrific. Miſſæ, Can.* 1, 2, 3.

"If

" If any ſhall ſay the Sacrifice of Maſs is only of praiſe and thankſ-
" giving, or a bare Commemoration of the Sacrifice of Chriſt upon the
" Croſs, and not a Propitiatory Sacrifice, or that it profits him alone
" that takes it, and ought not to be offered for quick and dead, for ſins,
" puniſhments and ſatisfactions, and other neceſſities, let him be accur-
" ſed.

So in that part of the Maſs called the Offertory, the Prieſt ſaith, " Holy
" Father, Eternal and Almighty God, receive this Immaculate Hoſt,
" which I thine unworthy ſervant, offer unto thee my true and living
" God, for my innumerable ſins, and offences and neglects, and for all
" them that ſtand here about, and alſo for all faithful Chriſtians, both
" living and dead, that it may profit me and them unto Salvation, into
" eternal life. *Amen.*

Again, in the Maſs-book the Prieſt prayeth: "We beſeech thee, there-
" fore moſt merciful Father through Jeſus Chriſt thy Son our Lord, and
" do ask of thee that thou wilt accept, and bleſs theſe † gifts, theſe †
" preſents, theſe hoſtly Sacrifices Immaculate, eſpecially thoſe
" which we offer unto thee for thy holy Catholick Church,-----and
" all them that aſſiſt here,-----for themſelves and for all theirs, for the
" Redemption of their Souls, and for the hope of their Salvation.-----
" Which Oblation, thou, O God, vouchſafe in all things to make bleſ-
" ſed † Aſcript, † Reaſonable † and acceptable; that it may be made
" unto us the Boſdy and Blood † of thy moſt beloved Son.-----We pre-
" ſent to thy excellent Majeſty of thy gifts and things given, a pure †
" Hoſt, a holy † Hoſt, an Immaculate † Hoſt, the holy Bread † of eternal
" life, and the Cup † of eternal Salvation.-----We humbly pray thee, Al-
" mighty God, command that theſe things be carried by the hands of
" thy holy Angels on thy Altar on high, into the preſence of thy Di-
" vine Majeſty, that we all who of the Particiſpation of thine Altar
" [*kiſſes here the Altar,*] have taken the holy Boſdy and Blood † of thy
" Son, may be filled with all Heavenly Bleſſings and Grace,-----*And*
then the Prieſt for the Dead prays, " Be mindful alſo, O Lord, of thy
" Men-ſervants, and Women-ſervants, [*naming their names that are*
deceaſed, for whom friends or kindred would have Maſs,] " who have pre-
" ceeded us with the ſign of the Faith, and who ſleep in a ſleep of
" peace.

View and conſider this little piece which I have tranſcribed, Reader, for thy ſake, out of the Maſs-book, and then judg whether there be any ſuch thing concerning the Lords-Supper in the Scripture; and whether theſe be not new Doctrines and Devices.

XVI. *Of Worſhipping the Hoſt.*

I. The Doctrine of the Scripture concerning the Lords-Supper, where it is treated of, containeth nothing for the worſhipping of it; as *Mat.*26.26,27. *Mar.*14.22,23,24. 1 *Cor.*11.24,25,26,27,28,29.

II. The

II. The Doctrine of the Proteſtants.

(z) Confeſſ. Helvet. 2. c. 21. Saxo. de cæna Dom. Wittemb. de Euchariſt. Baſil. art. 6.

"The worſhipping the Elements, the lifting them up, or carrying "them about for Adoration, and the reſerving of them for any preten- "ded Religious uſe, are all contrary to the nature of this Sacrament, "and to the Inſtitution of Chriſt. *So ſay other Reformed Churches in their publick Confeſſions of faith.* (z)

III. The Doctrine of the Papiſts.

(a) Nullus itàq; dubitandi locus relinquitur, quin omnes Chriſti fideles pro more in Catholica Eccleſia ſemper recepto, latriæ cultum, qui vero Deo debetur, huic ſanctiſſimo ſacramento in veneratione exhibeant, *&c.*

(a) "It is beyond all doubt that the faithful, according to the cu- "ſtom always received in the Catholick Church [*That is poorly begun of a learned Council,*] "may give in veneration the Worſhip of *Latria*, [*Higheſt Worſhip*] "which is due to God, to this holy Sacrament; for "it is not the leſs to be adored, becauſe it was appointed by the Lord to "be received; for we believe that the ſame God is preſent in it, whom "the eternal Father, bringing into the world, ſaith, *And let all the An- "gels of God worſhip him.*

(b) Concil. Trident. Seſſ. 13. cap. 5.

Moreover the holy Synod doth declare (b) "That with very great "Religion and Piety of the Church was this cuſtom brought in, that "every year upon ſome peculiar holy-day, this high and venerable Sa- "crament with ſingular Veneration and Solemnity ſhould be celebrated; "and that it ſhould in Proceſſions, reverently with honour and worſhip "be carried about through the ways and publick places.

XVII. *Of Auricular Confeſſion.*

I. The Doctrine of Chriſt and his Apoſtles concerning Confeſſion of Sin.

Luk. 17. 3, 4. *Jam.* 5. 16. 1 *Joh.* 1. 9. See alſo *Prov.* 28. 13. *Pſal.* 32. 5, 6. and 51. 4, 5, 7, 9, 14. In all which places there is Confeſſion of Sin to God, to the party wronged by us, and to one another; but not a word of ſecret Confeſſion of all our Sins in the ears of the Prieſt.

II. The Doctrine of the Proteſtants.

(c) Confeſſ. Helvet. 2. c. 14. Argentinenſ. c. 20. Auguſt. de Confeſſ. Saxon. de Pœnitentia. Wittemb. de Confeſſione.

"As every man is bound to make private Confeſſion of his Sins to "God, praying for the pardon thereof, upon which and the forſaking "of them he ſhall find mercy; ſo he that ſcandalizeth his brother, or the "Church of God, ought to be willing by a private or publick Confeſ- "ſion and ſorrow for his ſin, to declare his Repentance to thoſe that are "offended, who are therefore to be reconciled, and in love to receive him. So other Reformed Churches. (c)

III. The Doctrine of the Papiſts.

(d) Concil. Lateran. Can. 21.

(d) "Let every one both Men and Women truly make Confeſſion of "all their Sins at leaſt once a year to their own Prieſt, or ſome other, "having leave firſt from their own Prieſt, elſe he can neither abſolve nor "bind him.

(e) The

(e) "The universal Church to the great profit of Souls doth keep "the custom of Confession in that holy and most acceptable time of *Lent*, "which also this holy Synod doth most highly approve and receive, as "piously, and with good cause to be retained.

(e) Unde jam in universa Ecclesia, cum ingenti animarum fidelium fructu, observatur mos ille salutaris, sacro illo & maximè acceptabili tempore Quadragesimæ, quem morum, &c. *Concil. Trident. Sess.* 14. *cap.* 5.

(f) "If any shall deny Sacramental Confession, either to be institu-"ted, or to be necessary to Salvation by Divine right; or shall say the "manner of making secret Confession to the Priest alone,-----is not in-"stituted and commanded by Christ, but is an humane invention, let "him be accursed.

(f) Si quis negaverit Confessionem Sacramentalem, vel institutam, vel ad salutem necessariam esse jure divino, &c. *Concil. Trident. Sess.* 14. *can.* 6.

(g) "If any shall say that in the Sacrament of Penance it is not neces-"sary to remission of sin, and that by Divine right, to confess all, and "every mortal sin, that one can by all due diligent præmeditation call to "remembrance, even those that are secret sins, and against the last pre-"cept of the Decalogue, and the very circumstances which alter the "kinds of sin,----let him be accursed.

(g) Si quis dixerit in Sacramento pœnitentiæ ad remissionē peccatorum necessarium non esse jure Divino confiteri, omnia & singula peccata mortalia, &c. *Concil. Trid. Sess.* 14. *Can.* 7.

XVIII. *Of Penitential Satisfaction.*

I. The Doctrine of the Scripture.

Ezek. 16. 61. *Then shalt thou remember thy ways and be ashamed.*----62. *And I will establish my Covenant with thee.*-----63. *That thou mayest remember and be confounded, and never open thy mouth any more, because of thy shame, when I am pacified towards thee, for all that thou hast done, saith the Lord.* And 36. 31, *Ye shall loath your selves in your own sight.* 32. *Not for your sakes do I this.*-----*Be ashamed and confounded for your own ways.* See *Hos.* 14. 2, 4.

II. The Doctrine of the Protestants.

"Although Repentance be not to be rested in as any satisfaction for "Sin, or any cause of the pardon thereof, which is the act of Gods free "Grace in Christ; yet is it of such necessity to all Sinners, that none "might expect pardon without it. So other Churches. (h)

(h) August. de Confessione. Saxon. in Præfatione, & artic. de Satisfactione. Wittemb. de Satisfactione.

III. The Doctrine of the Papists.

(i) "If any shall say, that the whole punishment together with the "guilt, is always remitted by God, and that the satisfaction of the "penitent is no other than the Faith whereby he apprehendeth Christ "to have satisfied for him, let him be accursed.

(i) Concil. Trident. Sess. 14. Can. 12.

(k) "If any shall say, That God is not satisfied for sins, as to tem-"poral punishment, through the Merits of Christ, by the punishments "which he inflicts, and we patiently bear, or by such as are enjoyned

(k) Concil. Trident. Sess. 14. Can. 13.

" by the Prieſt, nor by thoſe that we voluntarily put our ſelves unto,
" nor by Faſtings, Prayers, Almes-deeds, and other works of Piety,
" and that therefore the beſt Repentance is only a new life, let him be
" accurſed.

(*l*) Concil. Trident. Seſſ. 14. Can. 14.

(*l*) " If any ſhall ſay, That the Satisfactions whereby Penitents
" through Jeſus Chriſt do redeem Sins, are not the Worſhip of God,
" but the Traditions of men, thwarting the Doctrine of the Grace,
" and true Worſhip of God, and the benefits of the death of Chriſt, let
" him be accurſed.

XIX. *Of Venial Sins.*

I. The Doctrine of Chriſt and his Apoſtles.

Mat. 12. 36. *I ſay unto you that every idle word that men ſhall ſpeak, they ſhall give account thereof in the day of judgment.* Rom. 6. 23. *For the wages of ſin is death.*-----See *Rom.* 5. 12. and *Iſa.* 55. 7.

II. The Doctrine of the Proteſtants:

(*m*) Confeſ. Bohemic. art. 4. Saxon. de diſcrimine peccatorum.

" As there is no ſin ſo ſmall but it deſerves damnation, ſo there is no
" ſin ſo great, that it can bring damnation upon thoſe that truly re-
" pent. So other Churches alſo. (*m*)

III. The Doctrine of the Papiſts.

" Some Sins are venial, neither offering injury to God, nor deſerving
" Hell, nor binding us to be ſorry for them, but may be forgiven by
" knocking of the breſt, (*n*) going into a Church, receiving holy
" Water, or the Biſhops bleſſing, or croſſing ones ſelf, or by any work
" of Charity, though we never think actually of them. (*o*) Thoſe
" ſins which in their own nature are not contrary to the love of God,
" and our Neighbour, as idle words, immoderate laughing, thoſe ſins
" that are not perfectly voluntary, as ſudden motions of anger, *&c.* and
" are in trivial things, as ſtealing of an half-peny, *&c.* are venial ſins;
" that is, do not turn us from God, and are eaſily expiated, like unto
" a ſlight hurt, which doth not endanger life, and is eaſily cured.

(*n*) Aquin. par. 3. Queſt. 87. art. 3.

(*o*) Bellarm. Tom. 3. de amiſſione gratiæ. Lib. 1. c. 3.

Idem. ibid. cap. 2.

XX. *Of the ſtate of Men after Death.*

I. The Doctrine of the Scripture concerning the ſtate of Men after Death.

Luk. 23. 43. *Verily I ſay unto thee, this day ſhalt thou be with me in Paradiſe.* Heb. 12. 23. *And to the ſpirits of juſt men made perfect.* 2 Cor. 5. 1. *For we know that if our earthly houſe of this Tabernacle were diſſolved, we have a building of God.* 8. *Willing rather to be abſent from the body and to be preſent with the Lord.* Phil. 1. 23. *Having a deſire to depart and to be with Chriſt.* See alſo *Mat.* 7. 13, 14. *Joh.* 3. 18. *Luk.* 16. 23, 24. where and in other places, the Scriptures ſpeak of two ways, one leading to deſtruction, the other to life. Two ſorts of men, ſome that do not believe, and they are damned, ſome that do, and they are ſaved, no third.

II. The

II. The Doctrine of the Proteſtants.

"The Bodies of men after death return to duſt, and ſee corruption, "but their Souls (which neither die nor ſleep) having an Immortal ſub- "ſiſtence, immediately return to God, who gave them. The Souls of "the Righteous being then made perfect in Holineſs, are received into "the higheſt Heavens, where they behold the face of God in light and "glory, waiting for the full Redemption of their Bodies; and the Souls "of the Wicked are caſt into Hell, where they remain in torments and "utter darkneſs, reſerved to the Judgment of the great Day: Beſides "theſe two places for Souls ſeparated from their Bodies, the Scripture "acknowledgeth none. So the Reformed Churches alſo (*p*) in *Helvetia*, *France*, *Saxony*, *&c.* (*p*)

(*p*) Confeſſ. Helv. 2. cap. 26. Gall. art. 24. Saxon. art. 11. Auguſt. art. 11. Wittemberg. cap. 25.

III. The Doctrine of the Papiſts.

(*q*) "If any ſhall ſay that after the Grace of Juſtification received, "the offence is ſo forgiven to every penitent Sinner, and guilt of eter- "nal puniſhment ſo removed, that there remains no guilt of temporal "puniſhment to be ſuffered, either in this life, or the life to come in "Purgatory, let him be accurſed.

(*q*) Concil. Trident. Seſſ. 6. Can. 30. & Decret. de Purgat. Seſſ. 25.

By this Parallel of Doctrines you may eaſily judg that ours is the old Religion, and the Religion of the Papiſts (wherein they differ from us), is a new Religion; for they that do own, profeſs and hold to the ſame Doctrines and Worſhip that were taught by Chriſt himſelf and his Apoſtles, and no other (as to Eſſentials at leaſt) are of the old Religion; and thoſe that forſaking and corrupting the Doctrine and Worſhip taught by Chriſt and his Apoſtles, maintain and hold Doctrines not contained in the Scripture, but riſen up ſince and contrary to it, are of a new Religion; But the Proteſtants do the firſt, and the Papiſts do the laſt, as appeareth by the Parallel of Doctrines; Therefore the Proteſtants are of the old Religion, and the Papiſts of a new One. For that Religion which doth agree with the oldeſt, and the only Rule is the oldeſt and only Religion; and if the Papiſts will keep to the firſt and ancient Rule, the Word of God, they muſt be of our Religion; if they will not, but add or diminiſh, they will never anſwer to the charge of Novelty laid upon them.

So that their inſulting and ridiculous Queſtion ſo often uſed, even till it is become odious and doth nauſeate, *Where was your Religion before Luther?* (which is the ſecond part of my Task), is plainly and fully reſolved in the Scriptures, and in the Primitive Churches. And methinks learned Papiſts ſhould bluſh and be aſhamed, (that have or can read the Writings of the Fathers, and determinations of ancient Councils,) to propound ſuch a Queſtion; but they do it to amuſe the common People that cannot read *Greek* and *Latin* Authors, and are not acquainted with the Hiſtory of the Church; whileſt I am perſwaded they themſelves know better, and could reſolve this queſtion themſelves, if they would read indifferently and judg impartially. But the

People that cannot read the Fathers, Councils, *&c.* might be abundantly satisfied, that our Religion is the old Religion, becauſe found in, and founded upon the Word of God; for all the Books in the World muſt give place to the holy, ſure, infallible Word of the moſt true and faithful God.

But though we ſhew our Doctrines in the Scripture, yet the Queſtion, *Where was our Religion before Luther?* (who began the Reformation in the year 1517.) is put to beget jealouſies in the People, that for many hundred years before him, our Doctrine and Religion was not taught nor profeſſed; and therefore call for a Catalogue of ſuch as have taught our Doctrines from the Apoſtles time ſucceſſively to the time of *Luther*; as they pretend they can do theirs; and would bear the People in hand that the Church as now Reformed, and the Doctrines now received by them, are new and upſtart things, and have not been ſince the Apoſtles times, or before *Luther*; the contrary whereof, that there have been ſuch Doctrines, and a Church owning them in all ages ſince they were preached by the Apoſtles, will appear by two Heads of Arguments; the one taken *a priori*, that ſuch a Church cannot, ſhall not ceaſe, but always be in ſome part or other of the World; the other *a poſteriori*, that it hath not ceaſed, but hath always actually been, and therefore before *Luther*.

The firſt, That it cannot, ſhall not ceaſe to be, taken *a priori* ſtands firm upon theſe two grounds; Firſt, *upon the promiſe of Chriſt*, that is of Infallible Verity; Chriſt hath promiſed that the true Church which is built upon the Doctrine of the Scripture, and is conformed thereunto ſhould continue always, and not fail: That the Reformed Churches are built upon the Doctrine of the Scriptures, and are conformed thereunto, appeareth from the Parallel of Doctrines before laid down. So that there is evidence from the Promiſe of Chriſt, that the Church holding ſuch Doctrines as the Reformed Churches do, did continue, could not fail; and there our Church and Religion was before *Luther*.

Secondly, *Upon the Relation between Chriſt and his Church*; Chriſt is the only *Head* of the Church, and the Church the Body of Chriſt. Chriſt is the *King* of his Church, and the Church ſubject to Chriſt. Chriſt is the *Husband and Bridegroom* of the Church, and the Church the Wife and Spouſe of Chriſt; ſuch a Church then could not ceaſe to be, elſe there would have been ſome time in which Chriſt would have been an *Head without any body* upon Earth, *a King without Subjects*, *an Husband and Bridegroom*, *without a Wife or Spouſe*; all which are abſurd, as to ſay a Man is a Father that hath no Child. But in this the Controverſie doth not lie betwixt us, but which Church is this Body, Subjects, and Spouſe of Chriſt, which by virtue of Chriſts promiſe and relation to him, could not fail or ceaſe to be, theirs, or ſuch as the Reformed Churches are. There is this ground (among others) on our ſide. That Church which owneth Chriſt to be her only Head, Husband and King, and no

other, which owneth and profeſſeth ſubjection to the Laws of Chriſt, and no other as neceſſary to Salvation, and worſhippeth the true God according to the Scripture, and no other, is the Body, Spouſe and Subjects of Chriſt, that could not ceaſe to be in any age; But ſuch Churches as the Reformed are, do own Chriſt to be their only Head, Husband and King, and no other, and profeſs ſubjection to the Laws of Chriſt, and no other as neceſſary to Salvation, and worſhip God according to the Rules contained in the Scripture, and no other. All which the *Roman* Church as Papal doth not do; for they own another Head beſides Chriſt, as neceſſary to Salvation, and profeſs Subjection to the Laws of another, beſides the Laws of Chriſt, and that equally with them, yea before them, though diſtinct from, and contrary thereunto, and give Religious Worſhip to others beſides the true God, and ſo plays the Whore and Harlot; that we might conclude, that ſuch Churches as the Reformed are, and not as Papal, are the Body, Subjects and Spouſe of Chriſt, which could not ceaſe in any age to be, ſince the Apoſtles times, and there our Religion was, and Church too before *Luther*.

The ſecond evidence that there have been the ſame Doctrines, neceſſary to Salvation, taught all along ſince the Apoſtles ſucceſſively to *Luthers* times, is *a poſteriori*, from the Writings of Men, and Hiſtories of the Church, even ſuch as are abundantly ſatisfactory to us and undeniable by our adverſaries, that our Doctrines are not ſo late as *Luther*. I had here prepared ſeveral things to be inſerted concerning the Succeſſion of the Church from the Primitive times, to the age in which we live; but becauſe I would not have this Diſcourſe to ſwell above the bounds of a Sermon, and underſtanding that there is a Reverend Brother deſired to treat of that particularly, to which I do refer you, I here omit them; yet the frequent demand of Papiſts, asking, *Where was your Religion before Luther?* and that part of this preſent Poſition, That it was before *Luther*, will not ſuffer a total ſilence herein. Though this is no real prejudice to the Truth of our Doctrine, or Religion, if we could not give a Catalogue of names that did hold and profeſs them in all ages, ſo long as we find them in the Scripture, nor could they for want thereof be juſtly charged, either with falſity or novelty; for what is in the Word of God is true and old, and what is not contained therein and made neceſſary to Salvation, is falſe and new, though of many hundred years ſtanding. That this is unreaſonably required by the Papiſts, no hurt to our Religion, as to the Verity and Antiquity of it, nor no cauſe of ſtumbling to the common People, familiarly aſſaulted in this point, and all becauſe not neceſſary to be known, will appear by theſe things following.

1. *It is not neceſſary to prove our ſelves to be men to give an account of all the names of all the men that have lived before us, no, nor of any of them.* It is ſufficient hereunto that we can prove we have the ſame Eſſential Con-

Constitutive parts of Men as our Predecessors had; that we have such Bodies and such Souls as they had, is a proof we are real Men as they were, though we know not the names of all the Intermediate persons successively by whom we have received our Beings from them: would not you laugh at one that would perswade you, you are no Men, or that the Humane nature is a new thing, because you cannot give a Catalogue of the names of Men from *Adam*, or from *Noah*, from one age to another? or would it not be sufficient proof of your Manhood that you have the same Identity of Nature as *Adam* or *Noah*, and Men of former ages had? So here; so long as we can tell and are sure we own and believe the same Doctrines that the Apostles did, we are sure we are of the same Religion as they were, though we could not give the names of the persons that have from time to time professed the same, this is as if one should say *Melchizedek* did not succeed his Progenitors, because his Genealogy cannot be given. Ridiculous!

2. *It is not necessary to know the falseness of any Doctrine that we should know the names of the Hereticks that have handed them down from one age to another*; but we know them to be false, by their being contrary to the Scripture.

3. *We know that the dictates of the Law of nature are good and true, and that we have such a Law though we cannot give an account of the name of our Ancestors from whom we have received them.*

4. *A man might be an exact artificer, though he be not able to mention the names of those that have been in all ages, that professed the same occupation from the times of those that did first invent them.* So a man might be a good Christian, and of the true Religion, and be ignorant of the many thousands Christians that have been before him.

5. *Without this knowledg a man might love God, repent, believe and be saved*, therefore not necessary to true Doctrine, Religion or Salvation; else every unlearned Believer must be acquainted with all the Histories of the Church, and Fathers, and Professors before him, which is impossible.

6. *If a man did know this, yet he might be damned*, if a man could tell all the Writers, Preachers, Doctors and Councils that have lived this Sixteen hundred years he might go to Hell at last. God will condemn men for being ignorant of the Essential Points in Christianity contained in the Scripture, and if they do not believe, nor are converted; but not for being unacquainted with the Histories of the Church, and names of those that did profess the true Religion in the ages before them.

7. *The Scripture never denieth that to be a true Church, that cannot, and because it cannot shew the succession thereof by Histories and Humane Writings.*

8. *The Scripture doth never send us to Histories, Councils and Fathers to judg of true Doctrine and Religion by, but to the Word of God.* Where in Scripture are Professors or Ministers either commanded to study, and be so conversant in all Histories, Councils and Antiquities as to be able

to

to give a Catalogue, who have taught or owned the true Doctrine in ages before them?

9. *What deceitful dealing is this?* to deny the People the reading of the Scripture and acquaintance with them, and in such things commend Ignorance as the Mother of Devotion, and will yet call upon them to say, Who taught your Doctrines before *Luther?* as if it were more material to know who taught them, than to know them; or to be more skilled in the Writings of Men, than in the Word of God.

10. *They call for that from us on our part, which they cannot give themselves for themselves on their part.* You ask, Who taught your Doctrines from the Apostles times? and we retort your Question, and who taught all your Doctrines from the Apostles times? We know you can never shew them. So that if we could not, yet we were even with you. I know you pretend a large Catalogue of Popes; but yet you are greatly puzzled to give their Succession, when there have been several Popes together, and they that then lived could not know which was the right. But if you could give a *Succession* of *Persons*, it profits nothing without a *Succession of true Doctrine*; if you could shew a Succession *de facto*, you can shew none *de jure*. That may be actual that may not be lawful. A thief may actually succeed a true Possessor, and a Tyrant and Usurper a lawful Prince, but not lawfully; this is Usurpation not legitimate Succession. We might say therefore to your People as you do to ours. Is it safe for you to continue in that Religion, of which you can give no account who have taught your Doctrines from the Apostles times? for you cannot, no, nor your Doctors neither, no, though they call a Council and search all Records and Writings of men, as shall be shewn in the next General Head of this Sermon.

Yet this is not said, as if we doubted of our cause, if it were to be tried by the Writings of the ancient Fathers, or as if we could not mention multitudes before *Luther* that have taught and owned our Doctrines; for there are many great Volumns and Cart-loads of Books in which our Doctrines are to be found. To give a large rehearsal of their words on our side would be an endless work, and not to be crouded into a piece of one Sermon: yet a few shall be picked out of many, sufficient to shew that our Doctrines, in which we do oppose the Doctrines of the Church of *Rome* have been taught of old.

What was the Doctrine in the first hundred year from the Birth of Christ is best understood from the holy Scripture; and this is that Age and the Writings of the Apostles are those Writings, by which the Writings of all other Ages must be examined, as their surest Rule, and that our Doctrines are there contained, and not the Doctrines of the Papists as such; see the Parallel before.

In the Writings of the Fathers that lived in the second hundredth year we have many Testimonies.

In this Age the Bishop of *Rome* had not that Power as now they chal-

challenge, as appears from a Letter of *Eleutherius* Bishop of *Rome* to *Lucius* King of *England* (r), who had sent to the Bishop for the *Roman* Laws, as they were framed in Religion, to whom is sent an answer by *Eleutherius*, *Ye require of us the* Roman *Laws, and the Emperours to be sent over to you.*-----*The* Roman *Laws and the Emperours we may ever reprove, but the Law of God we may not. Ye have received of late through Gods mercy in the Realm of* Brittany *the Law and Faith of Christ, ye have with you within the Realm, both the parts of the Scripture, out of them by Gods Grace with the Council of your Realm take ye a Law, and by that Law (through Gods sufferance) rule your Kingdom of* Britain; *for you be Gods Vicar in your Kingdom.*-----Afterwards, *whose Vicar you be in the Realm.* From whence is clear, that this Bishop of *Rome* (1) challenged not the Supremacy over *England*, but acknowledg'd the King to be Supream Governour in his own Kingdom. (2) That he acknowledged the Perfection of Scripture for life and manners, when Laws should be taken from thence for the Government of a Kingdom. (3) That *England* received the Gospel early, and not so late from the Church of *Rome* as some of them boast, nor at all first from them but from the *Græcians* of the East-Church (s), as some think.

(r) Fox. Acts & Mon. Vol. 1. p. 139.

(s) Id. ibid. p. 138.

Particulars would be abundance, but Brevity is one part of my task in this present matter; I must therefore take up with a Testimony or two of the Doctrine taught in this Age. (t) *Irenæus* testifieth that the same Truths of Apostolical Doctrine were in this Age.-----(u) And that the Church that was planted through a great part of the World, even to the end of the Earth, by the Apostles and their Disciples, received the same Faith that is contained in that which is called the Apostles Creed; and he gives a Summary of Doctrines to the same purpose as in that Creed is contained.

(t) Iren. adver. hæres. lib. 3. Id. lib. 1. c. 2.

(u) Euseb. Eccles. Hist. lib. 3. c. 24.

Unto these times (w) *Egesippus* that lived in this Age, declareth that the Church of God remained a pure and uncorrupted Virgin.----Moreover the same witness gives a general Testimony of the Doctrine in this Age,-----coming to *Rome* he met with many Bishops, of one mind and Doctrine, saith, The Church of *Corinth* remains in the pure and right Rule of Doctrine, and was comforted very much with their Doctrine. Being come to *Rome* I staid there till *Anicetus* was stalled Bishop,-----in all the Succession, and in every one of their Cities, it is no otherwise than the Law and Prophets, and the Lord himself did preach.

(w) Egesip. apud. Euseb. Eccl. Hist. lib. 4. c. 21.

After the Apostles many taught our Doctrines long before *Luther*: having but little room, I must take up with the fewer Heads of Doctrine, and fewer Testimonies under each Doctrine; I had begun to give a Catalogue in every hundred year since Christ, but that being too large for this place, I laid it by, and give Instances in these few following.

I. *The*

I. *The Perfection and Sufficiency of the Scripture to Salvation taught long before Luther.*

(x) *Justin Martyr*, who lived in the second hundredth year after Christ, writeth, That the *true Religion is contained in the writings of the Prophets and Apostles, who have taught all things necessary for us to know; we are not commanded to give credit to the Traditions and Doctrines of men, but those Doctrines which were published by the Prophets, and Christ himself delivered; all things are to be brought to the Scripture, and from thence are arguments and proofs to be fetched; for if a man be never so often asked, how many doth two times two make? he will still say, four; so a Christian discoursing with others will always alledg the Scripture.* (y) And *Irenæus*, "The Scriptures are perfect as spoken and dictated from the Word of "God and his Spirit.

(x) Just. Mar. in Tryph. & Paren.

(y) Scripturæ perfectæ sunt, quippe à verbo Dei & Spiritu ejus dictæ. *Iren.* adver. hær. lib. 2. cap. 47.

So *Tertullian* (z) An. Dom. 200, *&c.* writes, "I adore the fulness of the "Scriptures.------Let *Hermogenes* shew that it is written, if it be not "written, let him fear that wo appointed for those that add, or dimi-"nish. In another place, thus, (a) "We have the Apostles of the "Lord for our Authors; which never brought in any thing at their "own will, but what Doctrine they had from Christ, they faithfully "delivered to the Nations; wherefore if an Angel from Heaven should "preach otherwise to us, we would pronounce him accursed.-----To (b) this Objection [*the Apostles did not know all, or if they did, they did not deliver all*] he replieth, "That both ways such reproach Christ as "if he had sent Apostles either unskilful, or unfaithful.----Again, "In "matters of Faith, men must argue no other way than from the Scrip-"tures. In short, he lays down the Doctrines of this Age in a Confession of Faith, agreeable to (that which is called) the Apostles Creed, and saith, They are not doubted of by any amongst us, but Hereticks. In the like manner speaketh *Origen*, (c) that lived also in this Age, of the Perfection of the Scripture: "In the two Testaments every word "that appertaineth to God may be required and discussed, and all know-"ledg of things out of them may be understood; but if any thing do "remain, which the holy Scripture doth not determine, no other third "Scripture ought to be received for to authorize any knowledg. And more in other places *; and a large Confession of Faith also by him, and *Gregory Neocæsar*, containing the Doctrines that we hold. (d)

(z) Adoro Scripturæ plenitudinem—— Scriptum esse, doceat Hermogenis Officina, si non est Scriptum, timeat væ illud adjicientibus, aut detrahentibus destinatum. *Tertul.* adver. *Hermog.*

(a) Apostolos Domini habemus authores, qui nec ipsi quicquam ex suo arbitrio, quod inducerent, elegerant; sed acceptam à Christo Disciplinam fideliter Nationibus assignaverunt. Itaque etiamsi Angelus de cœlis aliter Evangelizaret, anathema diceretur à nobis. Idem de Præsc. Hæret.

(b) Solent dicere,——non omnia Apostolos scisse,——omnia quidem Apostolos scisse, sed non omnia omnibus tradidisse; in utroq; Christum reprehensioni subjicientes, qui aut minus instructos, aut parum simplices Apostolos miserit. *Ibid.* Aliunde suadere non possent de rebus fidei nisi ex literis fidei. *Ibid.* (c) Id. ibid. *Origen:* in Levit. Hom. 5. Tom. 1. * Hom. 2. in *Hieremiam.*

(d) Magdeburg. Cent 3. p. 34, 35.

(e) *Hierome* that died *An.* 420. thus, "Whatsoever we affirm, we "ought to prove out of the holy Scriptures, the speakers words have

(e) Hieron: in Psal. 98:

"not so much Authority as the Lords Command.

(f) Nihil, vel cautionis gratiâ jungere nos debemus mandato. Si quid enim vel addas, vel detrahas, prævaricatio quædam videtur esse mandati, pura enim & simplex mandati forma servanda.—Nihil vel quod bonum videtur, addendum est.—Docet igitur nos præsentis lectionis series neq; detrahere aliquid divinis debere mandatis, neq; addere. *Ambr. Tom.*4. *de Paradis. cap.* 12.

(f) *Ambrose* also who was born about the year 333, is of the same judgment. "We ought to add nothing, no, not for caution to "Gods Command; for if thou dost add, or diminish, it is a prevaricating "of the Command; the pure and simple form of the Command is to "be kept.-----Nothing therefore, seem it never so good, ought to be "added to it.-----Therefore we ought not to add to or take away from "the Commands of God. And he is more large which I cannot (for brevity) transcribe. (g) Again, he saith, "Who shall speak where the "Scripture is silent? *Augustine* (born *An.* 355.) subscribes the same Doctrine. (h) "In those things which are laid down plainly in the "Scripture, all those things are found which belong to Faith, or direction of life.-----(i) "Let us not hear, this I say, this you say, but "let us hear, this saith the Lord; there is Gods Book, to whose Authority we on both sides consent, believe, there let us seek the Church, "there let us discuss our cause. Let those things be taken from amongst "us which we quote, or alledg one against another, but not from the "Divine Canonical Books; for I will not, that the holy Church be demonstrated from the Documents of Men, but from the Oracles of "God. Again, "Read us these things out of the Law, out of the Prophets, or Psalms, or Gospel, or the Apostles Epistles; read ye, and "we believe.-----Again, our Lord Jesus himself did rather judg that his "Disciples should be confirmed by the Testimony of the Law and "Prophets. These be the proofs, foundation, and strength of our "cause.-----Again, "Let no man ask me my opinion, but let us hearken to the Scripture, and submit our petty reasonings to the Word "of God.-----We walk much safer according to the Scripture; Controversies are to be determined by the Scripture.------Again, I insert "the opinion of *Ambrose*, *Jerome*, &c. not for that thou shouldst think "that the sense of any man is to be followed as the Authority of Canonical Scripture. *Augustine* hath abundance more (in many places) of "such-like Doctrine, and he was above a thousand years before *Luther*.

(g) Sanctis Scripturis non loquentibus, quis loquetur? *Idem. de Voc. Gent. l.*2. *c.*3.

(h) In iis quæ aperte in Scriptura posita sunt, inveniuntur illa omnia, quæ continent fidem moresq; vivendi. *Aug. de Doct. Christ. Tom.*3. *L.*2. *c.*9. (i) Non audiamus, hæc dico, hæc dicis, sed audiamus, hæc dicit dominus. Sunt certe libri Dominici, quorum auctoritati, utriq; consentimus, utriq; credimus, — Ibi quæramus Ecclesiam, ibi discutiamus causam nostram; auferantur illa de medio, quæ adversus nos invicem, non ex divinis Canonicis libris, sed aliunde recitamus; quia nolo humanis documentis, sed divinis oraculis sanctam Ecclesiam demonstrari. *Idem de unitat. Eccles. cap.*3. Legite nobis hæc de Lege, de Prophetis, de Psalmis, de ipso Evangelio, de Apostolicis literis; Legite & credimus. *Idem. Ibid. cap.*6. Ipse dominus Jesus discipulos testimoniis Legis & Prophetarum confirmandos esse magis judicavit. Hæc sunt causæ nostræ documenta, hæc fundamenta, hæc firmamenta. *Idem. Ibid. cap.*16. Nemo ex me quærat sententiam meam, sed potius audiamus oracula, nostraſq; ratiunculas divinis summittamus affatibus. *August. de Mor. Eccl. Cath. cap.*7. *Tom.*1. Per Scripturas Divinas multo tutius ambulatur. Controversia ex eadem Scriptura terminetur. *Id. de Pat. Christ. cap.*8. Sententias Ambrosi, Hieronymi, &c. non ob hoc interponere volui, ut cujusquam hominis sensum tanquam Scripturæ Canonicæ auctoritatem sequendum arbitreris. *Id. Epist.* 112.

Chrysostome

Chryſoſtome alſo, that lived in the ſame age, and died about the year 407, taught the ſame Doctrine ſo long before *Luther*, in this point, as the Reformed Churches now do. Thus he writes: *(k)* " Would it not be " an abſurd and prepoſterous thing, that when we have to do with men " in matters of money, we believe them not, but count it after them; but " when we are to judg of things, we are ſimply drawn into their opi- " nions; and that when we have the Law of God for an exact rule, ba- lance and ſquare of all things. Wherefore I beſeech and intreat you all, " that ye matter not, what one or another thinks of theſe things; but " that ye would conſult the holy Scriptures concerning them. In ano- ther place thus: *(l)* " Theſe things which are in the holy Scripture are " clear and right; whatſoever is neceſſary, is manifeſt therein. Many more Teſtimonies we might have from this Author, and others quoted in the Margent, *(m)* but Brevity forbids the tranſcribing of their words. To conclude this particular take the Teſtimony of a Council, *(n)* wherein are many witneſſing together, that the Scripture is ſo per- fect that nothing is to be added to it. *Ambroſe* ſaid, " Anathema to " him, that addeth any thing to the Scripture, or taketh from it, and " all the Biſhops ſaid, let him be accurſed. And their own Canon Law, *(o)* reciting the words of *Cyprian*, That the Scripture muſt be followed, and not Cuſtom or Traditions. " If Chriſt only is to be heard, we " ought not to regard what any one before us thought was to be done; " but what Chriſt that was before all did; neither ought we to follow " the cuſtom of men, but the truth of God; when as the Lord hath " ſaid by the Prophet *Iſaias*, *In vain do they worſhip me, teaching the* " *commands and doctrine of men.* And again, *(p)* " It is not lawful for " the Emperour, or any other perſon piouſly diſpoſed, to preſume any " thing againſt the Divine precepts, nor to do any thing that is con- " trary to the Rules of the Evangeliſts, Prophets, or Apoſtles. Then their Writings muſt be perfect, or we ſhall often be at a loſs for want of a Rule to direct us. All theſe and multitudes more taught this long before *Luther*.

(k) Πῶς γὰρ οὐκ ἄτοπον ὑπὲρ μὲν χρημάτων μὴ ἐπιεικῶς πιστεύειν, ἀλλ' ἀριθμῷ καὶ ζυγῷ τοῦτο ἐπιτρέπειν, ὑπὲρ δὲ πραγμάτων φιλοσοφοῦντας ἁπλῶς ταῖς ἕξεσιν παραπίπτεσθαι δόξαις: καὶ ταῦτα ἀκριβῆ ζυγὸν ἁπάντων ἐχούσας καὶ γνώμονα καὶ κανόνα, τῶν θείων νόμων τὴν ὑποφασιν; διὸ παρακαλῶ καὶ δέομαι πάντων ὑμῶν, ἀφέντες τὶ τῷ δεῖνι καὶ τῷ δεῖνι δοκεῖ περὶ τούτων, παρὰ τῶν γραφῶν ταῦτα ἅπαντα πυνθάνεσθε. Chryſ. Hom. 13. in 2 Cor. *(l)* Ταῦτα σαφῆ καὶ εὐθέα τὰ παρὰ ταῖς θείαις γραφαῖς. Πάντα τὰ ἀναγκαῖα δῆλα. Idem Homil. 3. in 2 Theſ. cap. 2. *(m)* Cyprian lib. 2. Epiſt. 3. & ad Quintinum, & ad Pompeium; & ad Jubajanum. Αὐτάρκεις εἰσὶν αἱ ἁγίαι καὶ θεόπνευστοι γραφαὶ πρὸς τὴν τῆς ἀληθείας ἐπαγγελίαν. Athanaſ. Tom. 1. pag. 1. Η μὲν ἀληθὴς καὶ εὐσεβὴς εἰς τὸν κύριον πίστις φανερὰ πᾶσι καθέστηκεν ἐκ τῶν θείων γραφῶν γινωσκομένη τε καὶ ἀναγινωσκομένη. Idem. Tom. 1. 398. Η θεία γραφὴ πάντων ἐστὶν ἱκανωτέρα. Idem. pag. 114. vide etiam pag. 217. 428. Τὰ μὲν Σύμφωνα ταῖς γραφαῖς δέχεσθαι, τὰ δὲ ἀλλότρια ὑποβάλλειν. Baſil. Mag. in Moral. lib. Sum. 72. cap. 1. Vide etiam eundem. Sum. 80. cap. 22. & Homil. de Confeſ. fidei. & paſſim. *(n)* Concil. Aquileien. Surius. Tom. 1. de Concil. p. 477. *(o)* Corp. Jur. Can. Diſtinct. 8. c. ſi Solus. *(p)* Ibid. Diſtinct. 10. c. non licet.

II. *That the People ought to read the Scripture, and therefore ought it to be tranſlated into vulgar Tongues, was a Doctrine taught long before* Luther.

By *Chryſoſtome*, (q) "Let the Word of God dwell in you richly, he "doth not ſay, only let it dwell in you, but in great abundance. Hear "this ye worldly men, that have Wives and Children, how he com- "mandeth you to read the Scriptures, and that not ſlightly, but with "all diligence.-----Hear this I pray you all ye that are careful about the "things of this life, and get you Bibles, which are the medicines of "your Souls. Ignorance of the Scriptures is the cauſe of all evils. We "go to war without our weapons, how then can we be ſafe? *&c.* In another place he inſtructed the People, "That when they went from "the Congregation to their Houſes, they ſhould take their Bibles and "call their Wives and Children to participate of the Diſcourſe of the "things that were ſaid. And in another place, he exhorts them dili- gently to attend the reading of the holy Scripture, "Not only when "they came to the Aſſembly, but at home to take the Sacred Scrip- "tures into their hands, and this he doth by an argument drawn from "the great profit that they may receive thereby. Elſewhere he alſo "mentioneth that the *Syrians*, *Egyptians*, *Indians*, *Perſians*, *Ethiopians*, and multitudes more, had the Doctrines of the Scripture tranſlated into their own Tongues.

(q) Ἀκούσατε ὅσοι ἐστὲ κόσμικοὶ καὶ γυναικὸς καὶ παίδων περίσασθε, πῶς καὶ ὑμῖν ἐπιτρέπει μάλιστα τὰς γραφὰς ἀναγινώσκειν. Καὶ ἐκ ἁπλῶς ἀλλ' ὡς ἔτυχεν, ἀλλὰ μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς σπουδῆς.—Ἀκούσατε, παρακαλῶ, πάντες οἱ βιωτικοὶ καὶ κλάδε βιβλία φάρμακα τῆς ψυχῆς. Τοῦτο πάντων, αἴτιον τῶν κακῶν, τὸ μὴ εἰδέναι τὰς γραφάς. Χωεὶς ὅπλων εἰς πόλεμον βαδίζομεν καὶ πῶς ἔδει σωθῆναι, &c. Chryſoſt. in Coloſſ. Homil. 9. Item in Mat. Homil. 2. in Mat. Hom. 5. to this purpoſe alſo, de Lazar. Hom. 3. in Geneſ. Homil. 29. In Johan. Homil. 1.

The like alſo by Saint *Auguſtine*, (r) "It is come to paſs that the "Scripture, wherewith ſo many diſeaſes of mens wills are holpen, pro- "ceeding from one Tongue which fitly might be diſperſed through "the world, being ſpread far and wide by means of the divers Lan- "guages whereinto it is tranſlated, is thus made known to Nations "for their Salvation, the which when they read, they deſire nothing "elſe but to attain, to the mind of him that wrote it, and ſo to the "will of God, according to which we believe ſuch men ſpake.

(r) Aug. de Doct. Chriſt. lib. 2. cap 5.

To the new Doctrine of *Hoſius* Preſident (s) at the Council of *Trent*, *That a Diſtaff was fitter for Women than a Bible*; We will oppoſe (t) the Teſtimony of *Theodoret* of the old practice in the Church in this point: "You ſhall every where ſee theſe Points of our Faith to be known and "underſtood, not only by ſuch as are teachers in the Church, but even "of Coblers, and Smiths, and Webſters, and all kind of Artificers; yea "all our Women, not they only which are Book-learned, but they "alſo that get their living with their Needle, yea Maid-ſervants, and "waiting Women; and not Citizens only but Husbandmen of the "Country are very skilful in theſe things; yea, you may hear among "our Ditchers, and Neat-heards, and Wood-ſetters diſcourſing of the "Trinity and Creation, *&c.*

(s) Hoſ. de Expreſ. Dei verb.

(t) Theodoret. de curand. Græco. affect. lib. 5.

III. *That*

III. *That Religious Worship was not to be given to Images, or Reliques of Saints was taught long before* Luther.

When *Polycarpus* suffered, the envious Persecutors not willing that his Body should be honourably buried, as the Christians were desirous to do, they moved the *Proconsul* not to deliver to the Christians the Body of *Polycarp*, lest they leaving Christ, fall a worshipping of him; concerning which the Church of *Smyrna* (for I have not room for citations of particular persons) in their (*u*) Epistle to the Church at *Philomilium, &c.* said, *This they said, being ignorant of this that we can never forsake Christ,-----and that we can worship no other; for we worship Christ as the Son of God, the Martyrs we love as Disciples and followers of the Lord.*-----

(*u*) Euseb. Eccles. Histor. Lib. 4. cap. 15.

(*w*) About the time of *Sylvester* first, who was *Ann.* 314. a Council was so far from worshipping of Images that they would not have any Pictures in the Churches, lest that which is worshipped or adored should be painted on Walls. Also about the year 700, a Synod at *Constantinople* (whom the *Greeks* call the Seventh,) *did not only condemn the worship of Images, but also Images themselves, and that they should be cast out of Churches.* (*x*) *Gregory* Bishop of *Neocæsarea* (not the antient of that title, but another since him), wrote a Book against Images, which was read and approved by this Council, and inserted into the Synodical Acts as a common Decree; in which Book there are Testimonies of Scripture and Fathers against the Idolatry of Images; and that they would not allow any Image or Picture of Christ, but Anathematized them that should draw his Effigies in material colours. *Can.* 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13. and determined that there was one only Image appointed by Christ, to wit, the Blessed Bread and Wine in the Eucharist [Lords Supper] which represent to us the Body and Blood of Christ. The Second *Nicene* Synod was against this, and for Images, and a Synod at *Francfort* against the Second *Nicene* Council and their Images.

(*w*) Placuit, picturas in Ecclesia esse non debere; ne quod colitur, aut Adoratur, in parietibus depingatur. *Concil. Eliber. Can.* 36.

(*x*) Illiric. Catal. Test. Verit. pag. 73, 74.

Pezelius gives us this account, That *Leo* the third, Emperour, called a Synod about the year 730, in which it was controverted, whether Images were to be worshipped, *&c.* the issue whereof was that the Fathers then present, (except only *Germanus*, and therefore resigned, and one *Anastasius* was chosen in his room) condemned and subscribed, That worshipping of Images and Relicks was meer Idolatry, contrary to the Scripture; and the Intercession of Saints a Fable. The Emperour put the Decrees of the Synod into execution, commanded the Images to be brought into the midst of the City and burned; and the Pictures on Walls to be whited over, and so defaced; and did write to Pope *Gregory* the third, (according to some, the second) and commanded him, as he would keep in his favour, to do the like. After him his Son *Constantinus*, called *Copronymus*, out of his zeal called a Synod at *Byzantium*, Ann. 754. which is called the Seventh General Council, where were present 338 Fathers, where the Question being discussed, Whether

Whether it were lawful that Images ſhould [ſo much as] be in Churches; who receiving the Decrees of the firſt and ſecond Councils of *Conſtantinople*, *Epheſus*, *Nice*, *Chalcedon*; did determine with one conſent, that all Images ſhould as abominations be caſt away. *Pezel. & Lampad. Mellific. Hiſtor. par.3. pag.37,41.*

IV. *That Invocation of Angels and Saints is unlawful was taught long before Luther.*

By the Council of *Laodicea* which was about the year 364, according to *Caranza*, who relating the Canon I am to produce, for [*Angelos*] reads twice [*Angulos*] to evade the force of the Councils Canon, which he could not ſtand before, for which tricks of Legerdemain their Tranſlations are little to be truſted to; let us take it in the *Greek* Text.

(y) Chriſtians ought not to forſake the Church of God, and go and call upon Angels, and gather Aſſemblies, which are forbidden; if therefore any ſhall be found giving himſelf to this ſecret Idolatry, let him be accurſed, becauſe he hath forſaken our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, the Son of God, and hath approached to Idolatry.

(y) Ὅτι ὲ δεῖ χριστιανὸς ἐγκαλεῖσθαι τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ἀπιέναι καὶ ἀγγέλους ὀνομάζειν καὶ, συνάξεις ποιεῖν, ἄφρ ἀπηγορεύεσθαι. Εἴ τις οὖν εὑρεθῇ τοῦτο τῇ κεκρυμμένῃ εἰδωλολατρείᾳ σχολάζων ἔστω ἀνάθεμα. Ὅτι ἐγκαλέλιπεν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν χριστὸν, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ εἰδωλολατρείᾳ προσῆλθεν. Concil. Laodic. Can. 35. Codice Canonum Eccleſ. univerſ. Can. 139.

The Papiſts are ſo humble that they will go to God, by having recourſe to Saints, to intercede for them; this we diſlike. Who taught the contrary before *Luther?* Multitudes. One of which becauſe it is ſo pat, I will tranſcribe; (z) *Ambroſe* above a thouſand years ago condemned ſuch that uſed *ſuch a miſerable excuſe, in that they think to go to God by theſe, as men go to a King by his Nobles. Go to, is any man ſo mad or ſo unmindful of his Salvation as to give the Kings honour to a Courtier; which if any do, are they not righteouſly condemned as guilty of Treaſon? and yet theſe do not think themſelves to be guilty, which give the honour of the name of God unto a creature, and forſaking the Lord they adore their fellow-ſervants: For therefore do men go to the King by Tribunes or Officers, becauſe the King is but a man, and knoweth not to whom to commit the ſtate of the Commonwealth; but to procure the favour of God, (from whom nothing is hid, for he knoweth the works of all men) we need no ſpokeſman, but a devout mind; for whereſoever ſuch a one ſhall ſpeak unto him, he will anſwer him.*

(z) Solent tamen pudore paſſi neglecti Dei, miſerâ uti excuſatione, dicentes per iſtos poſſe ire ad Deum, ſicuti per Comites pervenitur ad Regem. Age, nunquid tam demens eſt aliquis, aut ſalutis ſuæ immemor, ut honorificentiam Regis vendicet Comiti, cum de hac re ſi qui etiam tractare fuerint inventi, jure ut rei damnentur Majeſtatis? & iſti ſe non putant reos, qui honorem nominis Dei deferunt creaturæ, & relicto domino conſervos adorant.—— Nam ideo ad Regem per Tribunos aut Comites itur, quia homo utiq; eſt Rex, & neſcit quibus debeat Rempublicam credere. Ad Deum autem (quem utiq; nihil latet, omnium enim merita novit) promerendum ſuffragatore non opus eſt, ſed mente devota. Ubicunque enim talis loquutus fuerit ei, reſpondebit illi. *Ambroſ. in Roman. c.1.*

V. *That*

V. *That there are but two places for the Souls of men after death, and consequently no Purgatory was taught long before* Luther.

(a) *Auguſtine*, born above a thouſand years before *Luther*, taught, "That there is no middle place for any, he muſt needs be with the "Devil that is not with Chriſt. (b) Again, "The Catholick Faith "reſting upon Divine Authority, believes the firſt place the Kingdom of "Heaven; and the ſecond, Hell; a third we are wholly ignorant of. (c) Again, what *Abraham* ſaith to the Rich man in *Luke*, "That the "Righteous though they would, cannot go to the place where the "Wicked are tormented; what doth it mean, but that the godly can "afford no help of mercy, though they would, to thoſe that be ſhut "up in priſon after this life, that they ſhould come out from thence, "and that through the unchangeableneſs of Gods Judgment. Again, "There is no place for the amending of our ways but in this life; for "after this life every one ſhall receive according to what he ſeeketh "after in this; therefore the love of Mankind doth conſtrain us to in-"tercede for ſinners, leſt by puniſhment they ſo end this life, that there "life being ended, their puniſhment never end. (d) Another, "What-"ſoever ſtate or condition, whether good or bad, a man is taken in "when he dieth, ſo muſt he abide for ever, for he ſhall either reſt in "eternal happineſs with the Saints and the Lord Chriſt, or ſhall be tor-"mented in darkneſs with the Wicked and the Devil. This cannot be Purgatory, for the Papiſts do not ſay that the Wicked, or the Devils be in Purgatory but in Hell.

(a) Auguſt. de pec. Merit. & remiſ. l. 1. c. 28
(b) Idem. Queſt. Evang. lib. 2. cap. 38.
(c) Idem. ad Maced. Epiſt. 54.
(d) Olympiodor. in 11. cap. Eccleſiaſt.

VI. *That the Marriage of Miniſters was lawful, was taught long before* Luther.

Long before indeed; for it is the ſixth of the (ſuppoſed) Apoſtolical Canons, owned by the Church of *Rome* in theſe words, (e) *Let not a Biſhop or a Preſbyter upon pretence of Religion put away his Wife; but if he do, let him be excommunicated, if he ſhall perſiſt therein, let him be depoſed.*

(e) Caranz. Sum. Concil. p. 14.

(f) The Council at *Ancyra* alſo did decree, *That ſuch as in their Ordination did declare their purpoſe for to marry, if they did ſo, ſhould continue in their Miniſtry.* (g) Another Council about the year 300 decreed, *That if any ſhould judg, that he ought not to partake of the Oblation from a married Presbyter, let him be accurſed.* And the firſt General Council at *Nice* that had this under debate after *Paphnutius* had delivered his judgment about it, did leave it at every Miniſters liberty to marry, or not marry as they ſhould ſee cauſe; (h) which the *Romaniſts* Canon Law doth alſo ſet down. Likewiſe this is fully ſtated in the ſixth General Council, *That the lawful Marriages of holy men ſhould be valid, but whoſoever is found diligent ſhould no way be hindred from that office, becauſe of living with his lawful Wife. Therefore if any ſhall preſume contrary to the Apoſtles Rules to deprive any Presbyters or Deacons, of communion with their lawful Wifes, let him be depoſed.* Well ſaid Council! and if this

(f) Concil. Ancyran. Can. 10. Codice vero Can. Eccleſ. univerſ. Can. 30.
(g) Codex Can. Eccleſ. univerſ. Can. 63. Concil. Gangrens. Can. 4.
(h) Corp. Jur. Canon. diſtin. 31. c. Nicæna Synodus.

this could have been put into execution, the Pope would have been down long before now, or mended his tyrannical dealings; and yet this stands in their (*i*) Canon Law, and they act quite contrary to it; here being so many Councils, and so many ancient Fathers in all these Councils I need not look for more, to tell you who taught this Doctrine before *Luther*.

(*i*) Jus Canon. pars prim. distinct. 31. c. quoniam in Roman.

VII. *Communion in both kinds was taught long before* Luther.

Ignatius, (*k*) *One bread is broken to all, and one cup distributed to all.* And by *Justin Martyr*, (*l*) *They give to every one that is present, of the consecrated Bread and Wine, as Christ commanded them.* And by *Cyprian* (*m*), *How do we invite them to shed their blood for Christ in the Confession of his name, if when they set forth to fight for him, we deny them his blood? how shall we fit them for the cup of Martyrdom, if before we admit them not by right of communion, to drink of the Lords cup in his Church?* In another place thus, (*n*) *Because some men out of ignorance, or simplicity in sanctifying the cup of the Lord, and ministring it to the People, do not that which Christ the Instituter thereof did and taught, I thought it both matter of Religion and necessity to acquaint you herewith by Letters, that if any be held in that error, the light of truth being now discovered to him, he might return unto the root and beginning of our Lords Institution, &c.* Fully and plainly by *Chrysostom* (*o*) "That the People have as "good a title to the Cup as the Minister, sometimes and in some things "there is no difference between the People and the Priest, as in the par-"ticipation of the dreadful Mysteries; for all are equally admitted unto "them. In the time of the old Law, it was not lawful for the People to "eat of those things of which the Priests did eat; but it is not so now, "for one body is offered to all, and one Cup.

(*k*) Εἷς γὰρ ἄρτος τοῖς πᾶσιν ἐδόξυφθη, καὶ ἓν ποτήριον τοῖς ὅλοις διενεμήθη. Ignat. ad Philad.

(*l*) Διδόασιν ἑκάστῳ τῶν παρόντων μεταλαβεῖν ἐπὶ εὐχαριστηθέντος ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος καθὼς παρέδωκαν ἐντεταλθαι αὐτοῖς Ἰησοῦς. Just. Apol. 2. in fine.

(*m*) Cyprian. Epist. 54.

(*n*) Cyprian. Epist. 63.

(*o*) καὶ θέμις ἦν πᾶσι μετέχειν ὧν μετέχει ὁ ἱερεύς, ἀλλ' ὁ νῦν, ἀλλὰ πᾶσιν ἓν σῶμα πρόκειται, καὶ ποτήριον ἕν. Chrysost. in 2 Cor. Hom. 18.

I must thrust in the Doctrine of *Leo* the Great, who was a Bishop of *Rome*, *Ann.* 440. and yet did count it Sacriledg, not to have the Cup received by the People. He saith thus, speaking of the *Manichees*, (*p*) "And "when to cover their Infidelity they dare be present at our Mysteries, "they so carry themselves at the Communion of the Sacrament, that "they may the more safely lie hid; they take the Body of Christ "with their unworthy mouths, but they altogether decline the drink-"ing of the Blood of our Redemption; which I would have you to "know that these kind of men by this mark being made manifest, whose "Sacrilegious simulation when discovered, let them be marked, and by "Priestly Authority be driven from the society of the Saints, *&c.*

(*p*) Cumq; ad tegendum infidelitatem suam nostris audeant interesse Mysteriis, ita in Sacramentorum Communione se temperant, ut interdum tutius lateant; ore indigno Christi corpus accipiunt; Sanguinem autem Redemtionis nostræ haurire omnino declinant. Quod ideo vestram volumus scire sanctitatem, ut vobis hujuscemodi homines, & his manifestentur indiciis, & quorum deprehensa fuerit Sacrilega simulatio, notati & proditi, à Sanctorum societate, Sacerdotali autoritate pellantur, &c. *Leo* 1. *de Quadragesi. Serm.* 4.

Be-

Becauſe in Councils there are many witneſſes at once, let us hear them. The Council at *Ancyra*, though but Provincial (yet as *Caranzæ* ſaith was confirmed by the General Council at *Nice*,) was according to *Caranzæ* his Computation in the year of our Lord 308, did decree, *Can.* 2. *That Deacons that had ſacrificed to Idols, ſhould not deliver the Bread nor the Cup in the Sacrament.* Whence it appears that in that age the Cup was given as well as the Bread. And the Council at *Neo-cæſarea* confirmed alſo by the *Nicene* Council, (ſo *Caranza*) *Can.* 13. did decree, *That the Country Prieſts in the preſence of the Biſhop, or Presbyters of the City, ſhould not give the Bread, nor reach the Cup, but if they were abſent, they alone ſhould do it.* At the General Council at *Chalcedon* conſiſting of 630 Fathers, the Seventh accuſation brought againſt *Iba* (*q*) Biſhop of *Edeſſa* was, *That there was not ſufficient quantity of Wine provided, that thoſe that did adminiſter were conſtrained to go to the Taverns for more.* But what need this complant, if the People were not to drink as well as to eat; this being a General Council, it ſeems that through the whole Church the Cup was given to the Laity; this was about the year 451. in the time of *Leo* the firſt. In the third *Toletan* Council it was decreed that through all the Churches of *Spain* and *Gallicia*, that the *Creed ſhould be repeated with a loud voice, and the People make profeſſion of their Faith, before they receive the Body and Blood of Chriſt.* At the Council of *Ilerda*, it was decreed, *That the Clergy that deliver Chriſts Body and Blood, ſhould abſtain from all mens blood, even of their enemies.* One more Teſtimony of one of their Biſhops of *Rome*, full and good Proteſtant Doctrine, which I find in their Decretals. The Doctrine of *Gelaſius* (*r*) who was Biſhop of *Rome*, (for as yet there were no Popes properly as now they uſe the word,) *Ann.* 492. thus, *We have found that certain having received a portion of the ſacred body, abſtain from the Cup of his ſacred Blood, (being intangled with I know not what ſuperſtition) let them either receive the whole Sacrament, or elſe let them be wholly excluded from receiving, becauſe the diviſion of one and the ſelf-ſame Myſtery can't be without grievous Sacriledg.* Well ſaid *Gelaſius!* ye Papiſts that ask who preached our Doctrine before *Luther?* in this point I ſay *Gelaſius*, Biſhop of *Rome*; and he taught of old that the not partaking in both kinds; is 1. Superſtition; 2. a maiming or halfing of the Sacrament; 3. that it is grand Sacriledg. Was your Biſhop in his Chair when he did thus determine; and yet will ye neither believe that he did err, nor yet give the cup to the People, though he did infallibly dictate this to be a duty. Surely he did err in ſaying ſo, or you do err in not doing ſo.

(*q*) Concil. Chalced. apud Surium, Tom. 2. Act. 10.

Concil. Ilerd. Can. 1. apud Magdeburg. Cent. 6. p. 467.

(*r*) Comperimus autem, quòd quidam ſumpta tantummodo corporis ſacri portione à Calice ſacri cruoris abſtineant. Qui proculdubio (quoniam neſcio qua ſuperſtitione docentur obſtringi) aut integra Sacramenta percipiant, aut ab integris arceantur, quia diviſio unius ejuſdemq; Myſterii ſine grandi Sacrilegio non poteſt provenire. *Corpus jur. Can. Decret. pars* 3. *Diſtinct.* 3, *c.* Comperimus autem.

VIII. *That in the Lords Supper after Conſecration there is true and real Bread, and true and real Wine, was a Doctrine taught by many long before* Luther.

By *Tertullian*, (*s*) "Christ taking the Bread and distributing it to his "Disciples, made it his Body, saying, *This is my Body*, *that is* (mark, "this) *a figure of my Body*. By *Augustine*, (*t*) who bringeth in our Saviour speaking after this manner, "Ye shall not eat this Body which "ye see, nor drink that Blood which they shall shed that will crucifie "me: I have commended a certain Sacrament unto you, that being "Spiritually understood will quicken you. By *Gelasius*, (*u*) saying, "The Sacraments which we receive of the Body and Blood of Christ, "are a Divine Thing, by means whereof we are made partakers of the "Divine Nature, and yet the substance or nature of Bread and Wine "doth not cease to be, and indeed the image and the similitude of the "Body and Blood of Christ are celebrated in the action of the "Mysteries.

(*s*) Hoc est corpus meum, *i.e.* figura corporis mei. *Tert. adv. Marc. l.* 4.

(*t*) Non hoc corpus quod videtis manducaturi estis, & bibituri illum sanguinem, quem fusuri sunt, qui me crucifigent; Sacramentum aliquod vobis commendavi: Spiritualiter intellectum, vivificabit vos. *August.* in Psal. 98. —— (*u*) Certa Sacramenta quæ sumimus corporis & sanguinis Christi divina res est, —— & tamen esse non definit substantia vel natura panis & vini. —— *Gelas. de duab. Natur. in Christ. contra Eutychen.*

By *Ambrose*, (*w*) "How can that which is Bread by Consecration "be the Body of Christ? by the words of Christ: What words of "Christ? By which all things were made; the Lord commanded and "the Heaven was made; the Lord commanded, and the Earth, and the "Sea was made. Seest thou then how powerful is the Word of Christ? "if therefore there be such vertue in the Words of our Lord to make "those things that were not, to begin to be, how much more power"ful is his Word, that they remain the same they were, and yet be "changed into another thing?

(*w*) Si ergo tanta vis est in Sermone Domini Jesu, ut inciperent esse quæ non erant; quanto magis operatorius est, ut SINT QUÆ ERANT & in aliud commutentur? —— Tu ipse eras, sed eras vetus creatura, postea quam consecratus es, nova creatura esse cæpisti. —— Sed forte dicis, speciem sanguinis non video. Sed habet similitudinem. —— Similitudinem pretiosi sanguinis bibis. *Ambros. de Sacram, lib.* 4. *cap.* 4. *edit.(mihi)* Paris, 1529.

This Author doth acknowledg a change, but not a Transubstantiating change, for he expresly saith, They be what they were. It was Bread and Wine before, and therefore though set apart for holy use, yet not changed into another nature. So as to substance, to cease to be what they were. And he giveth instance in our selves, when converted there is a change, of old are made new creatures, but not by being changed into a new substance, but our Souls set upon right Objects, *&c.* And when the Objection is made, But I do not see Blood in kind. He replieth, But it hath the likeness or similitude of it; and thou drinkest that which hath the resemblance of the precious Blood of Christ. This was taught then above a thousand years before *Luther* by this Father. And so it was by *Chrysostome* also, (*x*) Who saith, "If "it be perilous to put these hallowed Vessels to private use, in which is "not the true Body of Christ, but the Mystery of his Body is contained "therein, how much more, *&c.*

(*x*) Chrysost. in Mat. Tom. postr. 2. Hom. 11.

IX. *That*

IX. *That the Bishop of Rome was not the Universal Head of the Catholick Church, nor the Judg in whose definitive sentence all were bound to acquiesce was taught long before* Luther.

In the second hundredth year after Christ, there were six Councils, Provincial only, the cause whereof was the difference about the Feast of *Easter*; *Irenæus* (*y*) President of the Synod in *France* did write to *Victor* then Bishop of *Rome*, and sharply reprehended him for going about to sever from the Unity in Communion all the Churches of *Asia*; which pleased not all the Bishops. So *Eusebius*. In the year 418 was the sixth Council of *Carthage*, which resisted three Popes one after another. About the year 450 the Council of *Chalcedon* withstood *Leo* then Bishop of *Rome* in the question of Supremacy.

(*y*) Euseb. Histor. Eccles. lib. 5. cap. 23, 26. & lib. 7. cap. 5.

Illyricus upon his word affirmeth that he saw an Epistle of the Bishops of *France* and *Germany* (written by *Aventinus* his own hand) to *Anastasius* Bishop of *Rome*, and others of his Complices, the sum whereof was, *To admonish the Pope and those Bishops of* Italy *that sided with him, to let them alone, and not proceed to exercise their Tyranny over them.* The whole Epistle is to be found in *Illyricus*, *Catal. Test. Verit. pag.* 41.

The Bishops also of *Belgia* about the year 860, did contest with the Pope, whose Epistle to Pope *Nicolas* the first is taken by *Illyricus* out of *Aventinus*, in the close of which Epistle they declare that for the Causes before mentioned: (*z*) "They would not stand to his Decrees, nor "hear his voice, nor fear his thundring Bulls. Thou condemnest them "that obey not the Decrees of the Senate.--------We assault thee with "thine own weapon that despisest the Decree of our Lord God,------- the holy Spirit is the Author of all the Churches which are spread both "far and near; the City of our God, whose free Denizons we are, is "greater than that City which by the holy Prophets is called *Babylon*, "----which exalts her self to Heaven,-----and doth falsly glory that she "never hath erred nor can err.

(*z*) Hisce de causis, cum fratribus nostris & collegis, neque edictis tuis stamus, neq; vocem tuam agnoscimus, neq; tuas bullas tonitruaq; tua timemus; tu eos qui Senatus Consultis non parent, impietatis condemnas.—— Nos tuo te ense jugulamus, qui edictum Domini Dei nostri conspuis, ——Spiritus sanctus autor est omnium Ecclesiarum, qua longissime & latissime terrarum orbis porrigitur. Civitas Dei nostri, cujus municipes sumus, major est urbe, quæ Babylonia à sacris vatibus appellatur, quæ——cœlo se æquat, neq; unquam se errasse, aut errare posse mendaciter gloriatur. *Illyric. Catal. Test. verit. (ex Aventin.) pag.* 80.

Ludovicus the Emperour, Son of *Charles* the Great, and the Nobles and Clergy in his time did not own the Bishop of *Rome* to have that Headship and Power as now they claim and usurp, when by his Authority, without any mention of the Pope, he assembled several Councils; besides others he called four several Synods for the Reformation of the Church of *France*, *viz.* at *Mentz*, at *Paris*, at *Lions*; and at *Tholouse*, to enquire what was held answerable or contrary to the revealed Will of God, and wherein they departed from the holy Scripture. He was

so famous for the Churches good procured by him, that *Platina* bewailing the most horrible wickedness of the Popes and their Clergy in his days, that he cryeth out, *O Ludovice, utinam nunc viveres.* O Ludovicus I wish thou wert now alive. *(a)*

(a) Illyric. Catal. p.86.

(b) Magdeb. Centur.9.pag. 338. Proceres regni affirmare, inquit, illa nova & inaudita esse,quod Papa velit sibi de jure Regnorum judicia sumere, non posse eum simul Episcopum & regem esse, &c. *Hincmar. apud Magd. Cen. 9. p. 356.*

(b) Hincmar Archbishop of *Rhemes* openly published, "That it was "not lawful for the Inferiour Bishops upon any publick or general oc- "casion to consult the Pope, unless they had first advised thereof with "their own Archbishops; that it was needless for Archbishops to ex- "pect resolutions from the See of *Rome* concerning such things that are "already sentenced in holy Scripture, in the Councils, Canons and De- "crees of the Church. And expounded those words, *Tu es Petrus*, thou "art *Peter*, thus; Upon this sure and solid Confession of Faith which "thou hast made, will I build my Church. And as touching the Power "of binding and loosing he did write to the Pope himself, *Leo* the *4th.* "That that Power was passed and derived from St. *Peter*, and from the "rest of the Apostles to all the chief Heads of the Church; and that "St. *Peters* Priviledg took place only where men judg according to the "equity of St. *Peter*, and is of force wheresoever that equity is used. If *Luther* had now been born, (as he was not for many hundred years after) this would have been called *Luthers* Doctrine.

Monet Pontificem ne tam temere excommunicationes præcipiat. —— Sed patiatur causas diligentius in suis Provinciis cognosci, & juxta Canones dijudicari. *Hincmar. Magd. cen.9. p.524.* Luithpert: Otgarius, Guntherus Colonienses, Thetgondus, Treverensis, & alii Episcopi Belgici graviter tyrannidem Rom. Pont. redarguunt. Magd. Cent.9. p.338. item Ecclesiæ Græcorum, & Imperatores contra Papam, vide Mag. centur.9. 340, 341.

Likewise when *Leo* the fourth encroached upon the Church of *Germany*, *Luithpert* Archbishop of *Mence* writing to *Lewis* King of *Germany*, speaks much against the Pope, saying, "That the Churches Head "did ake, and if speedy remedy were not taken,it would quickly distil "upon the Members.

About this time 854,the Church of *Rome* had a sore miscarriage,when Pope *John* alias------not being like to other Males, was great with Child by his, rather her servant,and going to the *Lateran* fell in pieces, a good device to provide for succession, the Pope brings forth a Child; but since that time they have made a hole in Saint *Peters* Chair,that when a new Pope sits down, the Puny Deacon might search of what-----before the one Body of the *Romish* Church had two Heads, the one visible,the other invisible, but now the Head of that Church had two Bodies, and both visible.

(c) *Arnulphus* his Oration at large. See *Magdeb. Cent. 16. p.486,487, 488,489.*

Arnulphus in a Synod held at *Rhemes*, *(c)* noted the Pope to be Antichrist; saying, "What, O Reverend Fathers, what I say think you "him to be, which sitteth thus in a lofty Throne, in Purple Robes, and "glittering Gold? Certainly, if he be void of Charity,lifted and puffed "up only with knowledg, he is Antichrist, sitting in the Temple of "God;

"God; but if he want both Charity and Knowledg, than he is an Idol; "and to seek to him for answer is to enquire of Marble stones.

(d) Theophylact Archbishop of the *Bulgarians*, expounding these words, [*Upon this Rock will I build my Church*,] made no mention of the Pope of *Rome*, saying, "That Confession that *Peter* made should become the "foundation of the Faithful, in such sort that every man that would "build the house must necessarily put this Confession for his Foundation.------Of the Power of the Keys he said, "Though it were only said "to *Peter*, *To thee will I give*, *&c.* yet that Power was once given to all "the Apostles when he said, *Whose sins ye remit*, *shall be remitted.*

(d) Theoph. in Mat. c. 16. & Joh. 20.

Famous is the History of *Otho*, *(e)* who assembled a great Synod in the Church of St. *Peter* at *Rome*, of Archbishops, and Bishops in *Rome*, from *Millain*, *Ravenna*, *Germany*, and *France*; to which Pope *John* the thirteenth would not come, to whom a Letter was sent by the Emperour, that he would make his appearance to answer to the things of which he was accused, (and they were very *(f)* many and very hainous) to which Letter he returned this answer; "I hear say you mean to create "another Pope, which if you do, I Excommunicate you by the Om- "nipotent God, that you have no Power to Ordain any, nor to cele- "brate the Mass. When this Letter was reading comes in the Archbishop of *Trevers*, and other Bishops of *Lorrain*, *Liguria*, and *Æmilia*, with whose advice and counsel the Emperour and Synod sent this Answer, "That they made light of his Excommunication, and they would "return it upon himself; for when *Judas* had become a Murderer, he "could tye none but himself, strangling himself with an Halter.---------- *Otho* Deposed Pope *John*, and took into his hands the nominating and making of Popes afterwards. As yet Emperours were not come to wait bare-foot at the Popes Palace, nor to hold their Stirrups.

(e) Magd. Centur. 10. de Synod. pag. 433, &c.

(f) Johannes 13. Venationibus magis quam orationibus vacabat, & multa alia auditu indigna de eo dicuntur. *Caranz.* Sum. Concil. pag. 787. In hoc Concilio, objectis in *Joh.* criminibus, homicidii, perjurii, Sacrilegii, Incestus, aliorumq; nefandorum scelerum, &c. *Luitprand.* apud *Baron.* in Spond. Epitom: in annum 963.

(g) When the Pope *Ann. 996*, sent a Cardinal into *France* to Consecrate a Church there, the Prelates of *France* hearing of it, "Judged it to "be Sacrilegious presumption proceeding from blind Ambition, that he "should transgress Apostolical and Canonical Orders, especially being confirmed by many Authorities.

(g) Glaber. Historiarum lib. 2. cap. 4. Baron. Annales, Ann. 996.

(h) Gregory the seventh strictly forbidding Priests to Marry, writeth to the Princes of *Germany*, That they would not frequent the Masses of

(h) Adversus *Hildebrandi* Decretum (quo magna severitate Sacerdotum conjugium damnabat per universum Christianum orbem) infremuit tota factio clericorum; hominem plane hæreticum, & vesani dogmatis esse clamitans. *Nauclerus* Vol. 2. Generat. 36. apud *Magd.* Cent. 11. p. 389. Quod Sacerdotibus connubiis interdixit *Hildeb.* Pontifex, plerisq; Episcopis novum dogma, omnium maxime pestifera hæresis; quæ unquam Christianum perturbasset Regnum, visa est. Quamobrem Italiæ, Germaniæ, Galliæ Pontifices,——*Hildeb.* contra pietatem Christianam, verbis, factis agere, facere decernunt; eundem ambitus, hæreseos, impietatis, Sacrilegii condemnant. *Avent.* lib. 5. Annal. *Illyric.* Catal. & *Magd.* cent. 11. pag. 389.

Married

Married Priests: But yet the Bishops in *Germany* did refuse to yield to this Decree, or to depose those Priests that were Married, defending themselves by the *Authority of the Scripture*, *ancient Councils*, and the *Primitive Church*; adding thereunto, That the *Commandment of God*, *and humane necessity* did directly oppugn the Popes Decree. They long continued to defend their Liberty, insomuch that seeing neither Reason, nor Prayer, nor Disputation would serve the turn, the Clergy consulting together what to do, some advised, not to return again to the Synod, others to return and thrust out the Archbishop from his Seat, and give him due punishment of Death for his deservings, that by the example of him others might be warned hereafter never to attempt that thing any more to the prejudice of the Church, and the rightful Liberty of Ministers. The Archbishop spake them fair, and bid them be of good hope, he would send again to *Hildebrand* (the Pope) and they should have what would content their minds; willing them in the mean time to continue as they had done in their Cure and Ministry. The next year the Pope sent Bishop *Curiensis* as Legate to the Archbishop of *Mentz*, and assembled again a Council, where the Clergy were commanded under pain of the Popes Curse to renounce their Wives, or their Livings. The Clergy still defended their Cause with great constancy, in the end it brake forth into a Tumult, that the Legate and Archbishop hardly escaped with their lives. After this the Churches would chuse their Ministers themselves, and not send them to the Bishops (the enemies of Ministers Marriage) to be confirmed and inducted, but put them to their Office without knowledg or leave of the Bishop.

The Pope did write also about this matter to *Otho* Bishop of *Constance*, but this Bishop would neither separate those that were Married from their Wives, nor yet forbid them to Marry that were Unmarried.

(*i*) So the Clergy of *France*. *Fox.* Acts & Mon. Vol. 1. pag. 227.

(*i*) The Clergy of *France* did stoutly oppose the Popes Bull for the Excommunicating of Married Priests that would not Divorce their Wives, declaring their Reasons from the *Word of God*, *from Councils*, from the *necessity of Nature*, and *resolved to lose their Benefices, rather than put away their wives*; saying moreover, *If Married Priests would not please the Pope, he must call to Angels from Heaven to serve the Churches.* But if these Clergy-men would not be at the Popes beck, neither would the Angels in Heaven, I know not what other Angels may be.

In the Popes proceeding against *Henry* the Emperour, he was opposed by the Council at *Wormes*, in which were the Bishops not only of *Saxony*, but of all the whole Empire of the *Germans*, who did agree and conclude upon the deposing of *Hildebrand*, and *Roulandus* (*k*) was sent to *Rome*, who in the name of the Council commanded the Pope to yield up his Seat.

(*k*) *Roulandus* sacerdos, literas Imperatoris deferens, absq; omni salutationis honore, tibi (*Hildeb.* compellans, inquit) Imperator, — & Italiæ, Galliæ, Germaniæq; Episcopi, præcipiunt, ut te, munere quod astu, pecunia, gratia occupasti, abdices. Non enim verus pastor, neq; pater, neq; Pontifex es, sed fur, lupus, latro & tyrannus. [Brave courageous *Rouland!*] *Aventin.* lib. 5. An. Magd. Cent. 11. p. 425.

This

This same Pope was again judged and condemned by another Council held at *Brixia*, where were divers Bishops of *Italy*, *Lombardy* and *Germany*, in which Condemnation is recited amongst other things, his *Usurping Authority over the Emperour*, *and taking away and forbidding the Marriage of Priests.*

Towards the end of the thousandth year (when there was again two Popes at once, *Urbane* and *Clement* the third) *William Rufus* King (*l*) of *England* would suffer no appeal from *England* to the Pope of *Rome*, as it was not lawful to do from the time of *William* the Conquerour. And when *Anselm* Archbishop of *Canterbury* Appealed to *Rome*, the King charged him with Treason for so doing: All the Bishops of the Realm stood on the Kings side against *Anselm*; though *Anselm* pleaded hard, saying, *Should I forswear Saint* Peter, *I should deny Christ.* But all the rest of the Bishops disowned any Appeal from *England* to *Rome.*

(*l*) *Fox.* Acts & Mon. Vol. 1. p. 242.

(*m*) About the year 1105, two famous Bishops of *Mentz* recorded to be very virtuous and well-disposed, were cruelly and tyrannously dealt with by the Pope, (their Names were *Henry* and *Christian*), *Henry* would make no Appeal to the Pope, but said, *I appeal to the Lord Jesus Christ, as to the most high and just Judg, and cite you* (the two Cardinals that had done him wrong) *before his Judgment, there to answer me before the high Judg.* Whereunto they scoffingly said, *Go you before first, and we will follow after.* Not long after the same *Henry* died, whereof the two persecuting Cardinals having intelligence, said one to another jestingly, *Behold, he is gone before, and we must follow after according to our promise.* A little after they both died in one day; the one voided out all his Entrails into the draught; the other gnawing off the fingers off his hands, & spitting them out of his mouth (all deformed in devouring himself) died.

(*m*) Acts & Mon. Vol. 1. p. 254.

How the Clergy were against the Popes Decrees that they should put away their Wives, or lose their Livings, we might learn from a large Copy of Verses made by an English Author, concerning Pope *Calixtus*, for this.

O bone Calixte, nunc omnis clerus odit te,
Quondam Presbyteri poterant uxoribus uti,
Hoc destruxisti, postquam tu Papa fuisti, &c.

(*n*) Acts & Mon. 256.

(*o*) About this time the Bishop of *Florence* did teach and preach that Antichrist was now manifest, for which Pope *Paschalis* did burn his Books.

(*o*) Ibid. 254.

At this time also Historians mention two more famous Preachers, *Gerhardus* and *Dulcinus Navarensis*, (*p*) who did earnestly labour and preach against the Church of *Rome*, defending and maintaining that *Prayer was not more holy in one place than in another*, *That the Pope was Antichrist*, *That the Clergy and Prelates of* Rome *were Rejects, and she the very Whore of* Babylon *spoken of in the Revelations.* These two brought thirty more with them into *England*, who by the King and Prelates were all burnt in the forehead, and so driven out of the Realm, and after that were slain by the Pope.

(*p*) Illyric. Catalog.

At

(q) *Fox.* Acts & Mon. Vol. 1. p. 299.

At this time also in the City of *Tholouse* (q) there were a great multitude of Men and Women whom the Popes Commissioners did persecute and condemn for Hereticks; of whom some were scourged naked, some chased away. One of the Articles they maintained was that the Bread in the Sacrament after Consecration was not the very Body of the Lord.

Illyric. Cat.

In *Germany* also *Robert Abbot* of *Duits* preached against the Popes Jurisdiction as to Temporal Domnion, interpreted that place, *Thou art* Peter, *and upon this Rock will I build my Church*, to be understood concerning Christ, *&c.*

(r) Petr. Cluniacens. lib. 1. Epist. 1. & 2.

(r) Besides these there was *Peter Bruis*, Ann. 1126, and after him his Disciple *Henry*, Ann. 1147, in *France* drew many Provinces from the Church of *Rome*, preached against *Transubstantiation*, *the Sacrifice of the Mass*, *Suffrages and Oblations for the Dead*, *Purgatory*, *worshipping of Images*, *Invocation of Saints*, *single life of Priests*, *Pilgrimages*, *superfluous holy-days*, *Consecration of Water*, *Oyl*, *Frankincense*, *&c.* The Pope and his Prelates they called *Princes of Sodom*, *the Church of* Rome *they termed* Babylon, *the mother of fornication and confusion.* This *Peter Bruis* preached the Word of God among the People of *Tholouse* for the space of twenty years with great commendation and at last was burned.

I must but name *Honorius* Bishop of *Augusta*, who set out the Iniquity and Wickedness of the Church of *Rome* to the life; recited largely by *Du-pless. Mist. of Iniq.* p. 294.

And *Nordbertus*, Ann. 1125, that protested to *Bernard*, That Antichrist he knew certainly would be revealed in this present Generation.

(s) *Joh. Sarisbur.* in *Policr.* lib. 6. cap. 24. *Du-pless.* 319.

And *John* of *Sarisbury* (s) who visiting the Pope, was asked by him, What men thought of the Pope, and of the *Roman* Church, who told him to his face, They say the Pope is a burden to all, and almost intolerable. And much more.

Did the Papists never hear of the *Waldenses*, or have they not been vexed with their Doctrine before *Luther* was born, that they ask where was our Doctrine and Religion before *Luther?*

Did the Council of *Constance* condemn the Doctrines of *Wickliffe* and *Huss* as Erroneous, and was there such a noise about them, and yet did not the Church of *Rome* hear of our Doctrines (then owned by them) before *Luther?* they can never make us believe it.

(t) Inter omnes has sectas quæ adhuc sunt, vel fuerunt, non est pernitiosior Ecclesiæ quam Leonistarum; & hoc tribus de causs; prima est, quia est diuturnior, aliqui enim dicunt, quod duravit à tempore Sylvestri; aliqui a tempore Apostolorum. Secunda, quia est generalior, fere enim nulla est terra, in qua hæc secta non sit. Tertia, quia cum aliæ omnes Sectæ immanitate Blasphemiarum in Deum, audientibus horrorem inducunt, hæc magnam habet speciem pietatis, eò quod coram hominibus justè vivant, & bene omnia de Deo credant, & omnes articulos qui in Symbolo continentur, solum modo Romanam Ecclesiam blasphemant & clerum, cui multitudo Laicorum facilis est ad credendum. *Rainer. cont. hær. cap. 4.*

Let *Rainerius* a Frier writing of the *Waldenses*, or *Pauperes de Lugduno* satisfie them, who saith, "Among all the Sects that are or ever

"will

" will be, none can be more pernicious to the Church of God (he " means the Church of *Rome*) than that of *Lions*. And he giveth these three Reasons, (1) " Because it hath continued a longer time than any, " some say that it hath been ever since the time of *Sylvester*, others say " from the times of the Apostles. (2) Because it is more general, for " there is not almost any Country whereinto this Sect hath not crept. " (3) Because all others procure horrour by their Blasphemies against " God; this of the *Lyonists* hath a great appearance of Piety, in as much " as they live uprightly before men, and put their trust in God in all " things, and observe all the articles of the Creed, only they blaspheme " the Church of *Rome*, and hold it in contempt, and therein they are " easily believed by the People. A fair Confession of a Papist. So that you see, they can tell, if they list, where and when, and by whom our Doctrines were taught before *Luther*, but they use this Question to beguile the ignorant People, *Where was your Religion before* Luther?

And *Jacobus* of *Riberia* acknowledgeth that the *Waldenses* had continued a long time. The first place (saith he) they lived in was in *Narbonne* in *France*, and in the Dioceses of *Albie*, *Rhodes*, *Cabors*, *&c.* and at that time there was little or no estimation of such as were called Priests, Bishops and Ministers of the Church; for being very simple and ignorant almost of all things, it was very ealie for them through the excellency of their Learning and Doctrine to get unto themselves the greatest credit among the People; and for as much as the *Waldenses* disputed more subtilly than all others, were often admitted by the Priests to teach openly, not for that they approved their opinions, but because they were not comparable to them in wit. In so great honour was the Sect of these men that they were both exempted from all Charges and Impositions, and obtained more benefits by the Wills and Testaments of the Dead than the Priests.

Rainerius saith of them, that they had Translated the Old and New Testament into the Vulgar Tongue, they teach and learn it so well, that I have seen and heard (saith he) a Country Clown recite *Job* word by word, and divers others that could perfectly deliver all the New Testament.

The Doctrines that these *Waldenses* taught before *Luther*, are the same that the Reformed Churches do now hold; (1) As that only the holy Scripture is to be believed in matters of Salvation. (2) That all things are contained in holy Scripture, necessary to Salvation, and nothing to be admitted in Religion, but what only is commanded in the Word of God. (3) That there is one only Mediator, other Saints in no wise to be made Mediators, or to be Invocated. (4) That there is no Purgatory. (5) That Masses sung for the Dead are wicked. (6) All mens Traditions to be rejected, at least not to be reputed as necessary to Salvation. (7) That differences of Meats. (8) Variety of Degrees and Orders of Priests, Friers, Monks and Nuns. (9) And

Æneas Sylvius, Bohemica Historia de Waldensium dogmatibus. Fox Acts & Mon. Vol. 1. pag. 299, 300.

superfluous holy days. (10) And Peregrinations with all the rablement of Rites and Ceremonies brought in by man are to be abolished. (11) That the Supremacy of the Pope usurping above all Churches, and Kings & Emperors is to be denied. (12) That the Communion in both kinds is necessary to all People. (13) That the Church of *Rome* is very *Babylon*, and the Pope Antichrist, and the fountain of all other. (14) That the Popes Pardons and Indulgences are to be rejected. (15) That the Marriage of Ministers is lawful, and such-like. Their Doctrines are related by *Æneas Sylvius* afterwards Pope, none of their best friends. But the *English* Reader might find them in the Book of Martyrs. *Luther* lived and began the Reformation after the year 1500, these preached this Doctrine before the year 1200; look and see our Doctrine was before *Luther*.

In the year 1200, *&c.* it would be endless to give an account of particular Doctors, that did oppose the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, and did maintain the Doctrines we receive.

(u) Avent. lib. 7. p. 546.

I might mention *Almaricus* a Doctor of *Paris* that suffered Martyrdom for withstanding Altars, Images, Invocation of Saints, and Transubstantiation.

Also *Everard* (*u*) an Archbishop in *Germany*, in an Assembly of Bishops at *Regenspurge* gave his judgment of the Bishop of *Rome*. "*Hildebrand* (said he) under colour of Religion laid the foundation of the "Kingdom of Antichrist.------These Priests of *Babylon* will reign alone, "they can bear no equal, they will never rest, till they have trampled "all things under their feet, and sit in the Temple of God, and be exalted above all that is Worshipped: He which is the Servant of Servants "coveteth to be Lord of Lords, as if he were God; his Brethrens counsels, yea, and the counsel of his Master he despiseth. He speaks great "things as if he were God; in his breast he casteth new devices, whereby to raise a Kingdom to himself; he changeth Laws and confirms "his own; he defileth, plucketh down, spoileth, deceiveth, murdereth. "Thus that child of Perdition (whom they use to call Antichrist) in "whose forehead is written, the name of Blasphemy, I AM GOD; I "cannot Err; sitteth in the Temple of God and beareth rule far and "near. Was this *Luther*, that speaks so like him against the Pope? no, one born long before him, or else the Papists would go too nigh to "say, This Doctor had learned this from *Luther*.

The Preachers in *Sweden* publickly taught that the Pope and his Bishops were Hereticks. It would be too long to give account, how the Pope was opposed by *Frederick* the Second, and by *John* King of *England* a great while, though at last he delivered the Kingdom of *England* and *Ireland* to the Pope, and Farmed them of him for a Thousand Marks *per annum*; and afterward was poysoned by a Monk; and though he made this Resignation of these Kingdoms for himself, and his Heirs for ever to the Pope, yet his Son and Successor *Henry* the

the Third made great Oppoſition againſt; as did the Lords and Nobles in his Fathers days, and have left a Lamentation upon record of that fact of King *John.* (w)

(w) *Fox* Acts & Mon. Vol. 1. *Gulielmus Pariſienſis* circa Ann. Domini 1220, acerrime inſectatur Sacerdotes ſui temporis, dicens, in eis nihil pietatis ac eruditionis comparere, ſed potius diabolicas turpitudines, omnium ſpurcitiarum ac vitiorum monſtruoſitatem, eorum peccata non ſimpliciter peccata eſſe, ſed peccatorum monſtra terribiliſſima, eos non Eccleſiam, ſed Babylonem, Ægyptum ac Sodomam eſſe; Prælatos non ædificare Eccleſiam, ſed deſtruere, ac Deo illudere; eos cum aliis Sacerdotibus prophanare ac polluere corpus Chriſti, &c. *Lib. de collatione Beneficiorum.*

But the Hiſtory of the *Waldenſes* now ſpread far and near ſtands like a Beacon on an Hill that all that do not ſhut their eyes have clear light to ſee that our Doctrines were taught in abundance of places before *Luther*, theſe continued in *Dauphine*, *Languedoc*, and *Guienne*, and in all thoſe Mountains which reach from the *Alpes* to the *Pyrenæan.* They had ſpread themſelves into *Germany*, where were a great many of their Preachers who at the ſound of a Bell preached in a publick place, "That "the Pope was an Heretick, his Prelates ſeducers, that they had no "Power to bind and looſe, or to interdict the uſe of Sacraments, and "told them that though they had not come, God would have raiſed "up others, even of the very ſtones; for to enlighten the Church by "their Preaching, rather than he would have ſuffered Faith utterly to "have periſhed.

By this time they Ordained Preachers in *Spain*, which preached the ſame Doctrine with them, and in *Lombardy* much multiplied. Yea in one only Valley called *Camonica* they had ten Schools. Another ſaith, that their little Rivers ſtreamed ſo far as to the Kingdom of *Sicily*, and the only reaſon of their ſufferings is ſaid to be becauſe they withdrew the ſheep from the keeping of Saint *Peter*, and departed from the *Roman* Church. Do not you yet ſee where any were that owned and preached our Doctrines before *Luther?* Go then to *Jack Upland* (x) written by *Geofry Chaucer*, and anſwer his Queſtions, and ask this queſtion no more for ſhame.

(x) *Fox* Acts Mon. Vol. 1.

From the year 1300 the bloody Perſecutions and the great Sufferings of multitudes for the true Doctrine and oppoſition to the Church of *Rome* do prove what is ſought after, except they impriſoned and burnt ſo many, they know not for what. For Satan (according to ſome) being bound at the end of the firſt Ten Perſecutions, and remaining bound a thouſand years, was now let looſe again. Do they ask ſtill, Where was our Doctrine before *Luther*? why, where Perſecution was raiſed by Papiſts before *Luther*; for why were ſo many Impriſoned, Baniſhed and Burnt, if they did not look upon them as Hereticks, and whom they ſo call is notoriouſly known. Was not *Conradus Hager* Impriſoned for preaching againſt the Maſs, *Johannes de Caſtilone*, and *Franciſcus de Arcatura*, were they not burnt, and *Haybulus* Martyred, and *Johannes*

de Rupescissa Imprisoned for certain Propheſies againſt the Pope? Did not *Militrius* a *Bohemian* preach that Antichriſt was come, and was he not Excommunicated for the ſame? Was not *Occam* Excommunicated, and his Books prohibited becauſe they diſpleaſed the Pope?

Bruſhius relates that ſix and thirty Citizens of *Maguntia* were burned for following the Doctrine of the *Waldenſes*, *(y)* affirming the Pope to be the great Antichriſt. Alſo *Maſſæus* recordeth of one hundred and forty in the Province of *Narbon* were put to the fire for not receiving the Decretals of *Rome*, beſides them that ſuffered at *Paris* to the number of twenty four, and after them four hundred burned for Hereticks. *(z)* Was not *Matthias Pariſienſis* before *Luther* that writ that the Pope was Antichriſt? And was there not an old ancient Writing called the *Prayer and Complaint of the Plowman*, containing many things againſt the Church of *Rome?* and *Nicolas Orem* before the Pope preached againſt them.

(y) Fox. Acts & Mon. Vol. 1. pag. 550.

(z) Acts & Mon. Vol. 1. p. 521. to p. 532.

Was not *John Wickliffe* before *Luther?* and did not he maintain the Doctrines that the Reformed Church now holdeth? and a great company of valiant defenders of the ſame truths, twenty-five articles of *Wickliffe* you may read in the Book of Martyrs. *(a)* And may we not learn ſomething by the *(b)* Laws then made in *England* that many here did oppoſe the Church of *Rome*; as *Ann.* 5. *Rich.* 2. In the year 1380, we read of a great number called evil perſons going about from Town to Town preaching to the People divers Sermons containing Hereſie and notorious Errors (ſo Papiſts call our Doctrines) to the emblemiſhing of the holy Church.

(a) Acts & Mon. 1. p. 568, 569. Yea 45. Articles of *Wickliff* condemned in the Council of *Conſtance*. *Surius* in Concil. Tom. 3. p. 790.

(b) Acts & Mon. Vol. 1. beginning in the proteſtation to the Church of *England*. Had the Council of *Conſtance* ſo much ado with the Articles of *Huſs* and *Jerome*, who were charged with Articles againſt the Church of *Rome*, and condemned and burnt by the Council, and yet do Papiſts know none that taught our Doctrine before *Luther?*

And were there not many Witneſſes againſt Popiſh Doctrines and Aſſerters of ours from the year 1400? as *John Badby*, *Nicolas Tayler*, *Richard Wagſtaff*, *Michael Scrivener*, *William Smith*, &c. *John Huſs*, *Jerome* of *Prague*; but why do I mention particular names, when there were a great number of faithful *Bohemians* not to be reckoned, and many other places. The *Bohemians* in this age, near to *Tabour* Caſtle aſſembled themſelves together to the number of thirty thouſand, and having three hundred Tables elected in the fields for that purpoſe, they received the Sacrament in both kinds. *(c)*

(c) Cochleus, lib. 4. ex *Berkbeck*. Proteſtant. evid. p. 386.

In the Statute *Ann.* 2. *Hen.* 4. In the year 1402 in *England* there *(d)* were many Preachers of true Doctrine, which thoſe times called new Doctrines and Heretical, contrary to the Faith and determination of the holy Church, [*Rome* forſooth.] It is recorded in the year 1422, that *Henry Chicheſly* Archbiſhop of *Canterbury* did write to Pope *Martin* the fifth that there were ſo many in *England* infected with the Hereſie

(d) Acts & Mon. Vol. 1. Proteſtat. to the Church of *England*.

of

of *Wickliff* and *Huſs* that without force of an Army they could not be ſuppreſſed.

Beſides all theſe that have preached and owned our Doctrine long ago, we might ſend ſuch Papiſts as ask, *Where was your Doctrine before Luther*, to the Churches in other parts of the World, as to the *Greeks*, the *Muſcovites*, the *Melchites* or *Syrians*, the *Armenians*, the *Jacobites*, the *Cophti*, or *Egyptian* Chriſtians, the *Abaſſines* and others, who though too corrupt in many things, yet do agree with the Reformed Churches in many Points wherein they with us differ from the Church of *Rome*, as is witneſſed by *David Chytræus*, who travelled amongſt many of them, and from his perſonal knowledg and converſing with many that were amongſt them; and by Letters from others, gives an account of the ſtate of ſeveral Churches; and by the confeſſion of Faith in the Eaſtern Churches, compoſed by *Crytopulus Patriarch* of *Conſtantinople*, and others, as alſo by the confeſſion of Papiſts themſelves.

1. Theſe Churches do deny the Popes Supremacy, that he is Head of the Church, and never did ſubmit unto him as Univerſal Head; their words are, *It was never heard in the Catholick Church, that a mortal man, ſubject to a thouſand ſins ſhould be called the Head of the Church; but the Head of the Catholick Church is Jeſus Chriſt.* And much more they in their Confeſſion ſay. (e)

(e) ἐδὲ ἡ ἀκέδε παρὰ καθολικῇ ἐκκλησιᾷ ἄνθρωπον θνητὸν ἢ μυείαις ἁμαρτίαις ἔνοχον κεφαλὴν λέγεσθαι τ ἐκκλησιάς, &c. Confeſ. fidei, Eccl. Orient. per *Crytopulum*, cap. 23. Item *David Chytræus* de ſtatu Eccleſiæ, pag. 21. *Prateol. Elench.* hæret. lib. 7. p. 202. Idem p. 228.

The *Græcians* account Chriſts Vicar the Pope and the *Latins*, excommunicate perſons, *Prateolus*. Of this opinion are the *Moſcovites*, the *Armenians*, *&c.*

2. Theſe Churches agree with us in rejecting the Apocryphal Book from the number of Canonical Scriptures. (f)

(f) Confeſſ. fidei Eccleſ. Orient. per *Crytop*, cap. 7.

3. They give the Sacrament in both kinds; they ſay of neceſſity they muſt communicate in both kinds, ſo that if any take it under one kind, although a Lay-man, he is ſaid to ſin, becauſe they ſay he doth againſt Chriſts command. So *Prateolus*. All partake of both kinds, the Bread and the Cup, whether Eccleſiaſtical, or Lay-perſons, Men and Women. (g)

(g) *Prateol.* Elenc. hæret. p. 202. Μετέχεσι ἢ πάντες ἑκατέρου εἴδους τῶν ἐν τῇ δεσποτικῇ τραπέζῃ, τοῦτ' ἄρτου καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου; ἐκκλησιαστικοί τε καὶ λαϊκοί, ἄνδρες καὶ γυναῖκες. Confeſ. fid. Eccleſ. Orient. cap. 9.

4. They turn not the Sacrament into a Sacrifice offered for the quick and dead.

(h) Ex Liturgiis Græcorum & narrationibus hominum fide dignorum conſtat, nec miſſas privatas abſq; communicantibus ab eis celebrari ſolere, nec ullâm in eorem canone, ſacrificii corporis & ſanguinis Chriſti pro redemptione vivorum & mortuorum oblati, mentionem fieri, &c. *David Chytr.* de ſtatu Eccleſ. p. 14.

5. They have no private Maſſes, theſe both are teſtified by *Chytræus*. (g)

6. The

(i) Τὴν ἀληθῆ καὶ Θεῖαν παρουσίαν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὁμολογοῦμεν, καὶ πιστεύομεν, πλὴν ἣν ἡ πίστις ἡμῖν παείσησι καὶ περιφέρει, ἐκ ἐν ἡ ἐφιεμενθεῖσα εἰκὼν διδάσκει μεταποίησις, &c. Cyril Patriarch. Conſtant. cap. 17. p. 60.

6. The Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation is not received amongſt them, they confeſs a true and real Preſence in the Lords-Supper, but ſuch a one as Faith offereth, not ſuch as the deviſed Tranſubſtantiation vainly teacheth. (i)

(k) Confeſ. fidei Eccl. Orient per *Critop.* cap. 5. ὡς εἶναι τὰ πρὸς σωτηρίαν ἀναγκαῖα μυστήρια τρία; βάπτισμα, κοινωνία μετάνοια.

7. They admit not the ſeven Popiſh Sacraments, they own properly but three, Baptiſm, the Lords-Supper and Penance. (k)

(l) Confeſ. fidei Eccleſ. Orient. c. 11. & *David Chytræus* de ſtat. Eccl. p. 14.

8. They admit Miniſters Marriage. (l)

9. They deny Purgatory. It is true the *Greek* Church do believe that there is a place diſtinct from Heaven and Hell, where ſome departed Souls are lodged for a while; their opinion is, That thoſe that lived holily, and died in the Lord go immediately to Heaven, and the wicked that die without repentance go preſently to Hell; but ſuch as are converted at the end of their life are in another place, in a middle condition, and for theſe they pray, but yet they do not call this Purgatory. So *Chytræus.* And in their Confeſſion they utterly deny Popiſh Purgatory, for they affirm the puniſhment of ſuch departed Souls that are neither in Heaven nor in Hell, *is not material,* (m) *neither by fire, nor by any other matter, but only from the affliction and anguiſh of their own Conſciences, remembring then what they did amiſs while they were in this world.* However they be far from the truth, yet they be far alſo from Purgatory fire. For *Alphonſus* ſaith, That it is one of the moſt known Errors of the *Græcians* and *Armenians*, that they teach no place of Purgatory, *&c.*

(m) Λέγει τοίνυν ἡ ἐκκλησία τῶν ἐκείνων ποινὴν μὴ ὑλικὴν εἶναι, εἶτ' ἔν ὀργανικὴν, μὴ διὰ πυρὸς μήτε δι' ἄλλης, ὁποιας ἔν ὕλης, ἀλλὰ διὰ θλίψεως καὶ ἀνίας τ' ἀπ' συνειδήσεως συμβαίνουσαν τέλοις ἐκ τῆ μιμνήσκεσθαι τῶν ὅσα ἐν τῷ κόσμω μὴ κατὰ λόγον μηδὲ ὁσίως ἔπραξαν. Confeſſ. eadem cap. 20. Unus ex notiſſimis erroribus Græcorum & Armenorum eſt, quo docent nullum eſſe Purgatorium locum, *&c.* Alphonſ. adver. hæreſ. lib. 12. p. 188.

10. Though the *Greeks* dote too much upon Images of Saints, yet they differ much from Papiſts in this point; for they are againſt making any Image of God which the Papiſts do in the likeneſs of an old man; and to other Images they give (τιμὴν) honour, but neither the Worſhip of *Latria*, nor *Dulia*: (No, ſay they,) God forbid, for theſe are only to be given to God. (n)

(n) Οὐ γὰρ θέμις τὸν ἀπερίγραπτον θεὸν περιγραπτῇ εἰκόνι παρεικάζειν ----- Αἷς ἁγίαις εἰκόσι καὶ τίμην τῶν προσήκουσαν ἀπένειμεν: διαφορικὴν ἢ δουλικὴν, ἅπαγε, αὗται γὰρ θεῷ μόνῳ προσήκουσιν. Confeſſ. fid. Eccl. Orient. per *Critop.* cap. 15.

11. They carry not the Sacrament in proceſſion about the ſtreets, (as the Papiſts do to be worſhipped by them that meet it) except they ſend

send it to the sick; for say they it was not given to be carried about the streets, but religiously to be received for the remission of sins, according to the Word of God. (o)

(o) Ὃν φερόμενον ἐπὶ τοῦτο τὸ ἅγιον μυστήριον διὰ τῶν πολεμίων, ἀλλ' ἢ μόνον ὅταν κομίζηται εἰς ὄικον νοσοῦντος, ὅτι ἐδόθη ἡμῖν τοῦτο ἵνα φυλάττηται διὰ τῶν πολεμίων, ἀλλ' ἵνα εὐλαβῶς μεταλάβωμεν εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, καὶ τὰ θεοπνευστα ῥήματα. Confess. fid. Eccl. Orient. per eundem cap. 9.

12. They hold the perfection and sufficiency of the Scripture, that it is Sacriledg to add any thing to it, or take away from it, and contradict those that do. (p)

(p) Ἥτις ἁγία γραφὴ ἐνεπνεύσθη ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ, ὥστε μήτε προσλαβεῖσα, ἢ ἀφαιρεθεῖσα ἐκεῖθεν (τοῦτο γὰρ ἄνομος ἱεροσυλία) ἀλλὰ καὶ τοιοῦτόν τι τολμῶντας, ἐλέγχει καὶ καταφανῆ. Confess. fid. Eccl. Orient. cap. 7.

13. Concerning the marks of the true Catholick and Apostolical Church they greatly differ from the Church of *Rome*; the Confession mentions four, and the last they lay most stress upon, wherein they teach the same with us, namely that it faithfully and sincerely keep the Word of God, which God hath given to us by his Prophets and Apostles. (q)

(q) Τέταρτον καὶ σαφέστατον ἐκκλησίας γνώρισμα, τὸ πιστῶς καὶ ἀδόλως παραφυλάττειν τὸ θεῖον ῥῆμα ὃ ὁ θεὸς ἐξέθετο διὰ προφητῶν καὶ ἀποστόλων. Confess. fid. Eccl. Orient. cap. 7.

14. They do not define the Catholick Church as the *Romanists* do, by making it essential to submit to any one man as the Head of the whole, but the whole company of such as are found in the Doctrine of Christ, every-where dispersed, but knit together by the bond of the Spirit is the Catholick Church. *Confess. eadem cap.* 7.

By all this (Reader) laid down in as little room as I could, thou maist see, the harsh and uncharitable spirit of the *Romanists*, to unchurch all these, who do profess that they keep to all the Doctrines of the first General Councils, (r) in which essential Doctrines were ratified as appears by their Creeds, containing the Articles of the Christian Faith, (but the *Moscovites* condemn and curse the *Romans* as forsakers of the Primitive Church, and breaking of the seven General Synods.) As also thou maist see their impudence in asking where our Church and Doctrines were before *Luther*; where there have been so many Churches ever since the Apostles times that have (though not without many corruptions in many things, yet) held to the essential Doctrines of Christian Religion, and have not received these Doctrines of the Church of *Rome*, which is but a little Church in comparison of all the rest, amongst whom our Religion was before *Luther*.

(r) Ἑπτὰ καὶ μόνας οἰκουμενικὰς Συνόδους ἡμεῖς ἀποδεχόμεθα. — καὶ ὅσαι αἱ οἰκουμενικαὶ ἐπὶ ἐδέξαντο τὲ καὶ ἐβεβαίωσαν. Confess. eadem, cap 15. Acta septem Synodorum Græcarum, Scripta Basilii, Chrysostomi, Damasceni, eorumq; traditiones tanquam divina oracula amplectantur, ad eaq; de fide & Religione ipsorum scisitantes remittunt, ex literis *Constantin.* ad *Dav. Chytr.* de statu Eccles. p. 71.

Having

Having made appear that the Doctrines of the Reformed Churches are the same that were taught by Christ and his Apostles, and that by many after them long before *Luther*; the next thing is to demonstrate *that Popery is a Novelty*; this follows indeed by just and good consequence from what hath hitherto been said in the former parts of the method first proposed to speak of this Position in; for two such Doctrines as are so contrary, yea so contradictory, cannot both be true, and equally old; for Truth must be before Error. But yet that Popery had not its being till many hundred years (as now framed) after Christ, I shall pick out some of the chief and most material Points of Popery, (and if these fall the other cannot stand) and give an account of the time when they first came in; the rest whose rise and original as to the particular time is more uncertain, though clear enough that they were not from the beginning, *nor long*, *long after*, will not need such large insisting on; and yet in all I must endeavour Brevity, which is a task that lyeth upon me, and pincheth me hard all along in such a copious subject as this Position is.

First, I *shall begin at the head*, (which is indeed the head and heart of Popery) which though by that Age it hath, gray hairs are upon it, yet in comparison of true Antiquity indeed, it will appear that their head is both raw and green, and if the head be young the whole body cannot be old; and the Witnesses to give in their Testimony of the minority of the Pope as Head of the Church as now claimed, are at hand, even six several Councils, which have so polled this head, and clipt his beard, that it looketh very young, and bear his age marvellously well; for look upon him in the glass of true History and no man will believe that he is so old as he brags to be.

First, my first Catalogue of Witnesses consists of three hundred and eighteen grave ancient Fathers assembled in the first General Council (that ever was since the Apostles times,) at *Nice*, in the year of our Lord 325. In reading over the Canons of this Council, I fix upon two, which are fully and directly against the Popes Universal Soveraignty and Dominion above all other Churches; the one is against Excommunicate persons Appeal in any Dioceses unto remote Churches; or being harboured or received by them in these words.

Concerning persons Excommunicated, whether they be of the Clergy or the Laity, (s) *Let this sentence be observed by the Bishops of every Province, according to the Canon, which saith, That those which are cast out by some, shall not be admitted by others.* This Canon clips the Power of the Pope, and takes away his Jurisdiction over other Churches; and was so understood of old is plain, because when some were Excommu-

(s) Περὶ τῶν ἀκοινωνήτων γενομένων. εἴτε ἐν κλήρῳ, εἴτε ἐν λαϊκῷ τάγματι τεταγμένων; ὡσὰν καὶ ἐκάστην ἐπαρχίαν ἐπισκόπων κρατεῖτο ἡ γνώμη κατὰ τὸν κανόνα τὸν διαγορεύοντα, τὰς ὑφ' ἑτέρων ἀποβληθείσας, ὑφ' ἑτέρων μὴ προσίεσθαι. ——— Codex Can. Eccles. Univers. Can. 5.

nicated

nicated in *Africk*, and did run to, and were entertained by the Bishop of *Rome*, the Council in *Africk* did hold irregular, and did write to the Pope so too, and alledged this Canon of the Council of *Nice*, that he ought not to admit them whom they had Excommunicated; of which more when I come to that Council.

The other Canon in this Council runs, (t) *Let the ancient customs obtain* [continue in force] *which are in Egypt, Libya and Pentapolis, that the Bishop of Alexandria have power* [authority, the Government] *of all these; because also the Bishop of Rome hath the same custom. Likewise also in Antioch, and in other Provinces, let the Churches have their Dignities,* [Priviledges, Prerogatives] *preserved,* [secured] *to them.*-------From thus much of this Canon we easily learn. First, that the Bishop of *Rome* had not Universal Jurisdiction over all the Churches, because the Bishop of *Alexandria* was to have the same Power, [ἐξουσίαν] Authority, over those parts, and the Bishop of *Antioch* in those parts, and others in other Provinces, as the Bishop of *Rome* had in those parts, which could not be if the Bishop of *Rome* were Universal, and they Provincial underlings, for there is not like Power, Authority, or Equality in an Universal and Provincial Bishop according to their own Doctrine. Secondly, we as easily see, that what Power the Pope had, is not by this Council bottomed upon, and derived from the holy Scriptures, or succession from *Peter*, but grounded only upon custom; not a word is here of any Divine right to that power or place in which he then was, which was far inferior to what he claimeth and usurpeth now. For the first three hundred year then, an Universal Head was a *non-ens*, not risen, nor acknowledged in the Church of God. Very good.

(t) Τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθη κρατείτω, τὰ ἐν αἰγύπτῳ καὶ Λιβύῃ καὶ Πενταπόλει, ὡσε τὸν ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ ἐπίσκοπον πάντων τούτων ἔχειν τὴν ἐξουσίαν· ἐπειδὴ καὶ τῷ ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ἐπισκόπῳ τοῦτο συνηθές ἐστιν· ὁμοίως τὰ καὶ κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν, καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις ἐπαρχίαις τὰ πρεσβεῖα σώζεσθαι ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις.—Codex Can. Eccles. Univers. Can. 6.

Secondly, the next Catalogue of Witnesses against the Universal Soveraignty of the Bishop of *Rome*, hath in it *one hundred and fifty Fathers*, assembled at *Constantinople* (which *Caranza* saith, is one of the four principal Councils, and next after the Council of *Nice*, whose Authority is already alledged,) about the *year three hundred eighty three.* (So *Codex Canonum.*) These in their first Canon did ratifie and confirm what was done in the *Nicene* Council, and would have it to be observed without violation. Moreover (u) they did Decree, *That no Bishop of any Diocess should go to any Churches beyond their own bounds, to meddle with them, nor confound or mingle Churches, but according to the Canons, the Bishop of* Alexandria *should govern what belongs to* Egypt; *and the Bishops of the East only the East, reserving the Privileges,* [Dignities] *by the Canons of the Council of* Nice *to the Church of* Antioch; *and the Bishops of*

Caranz. p. 200.

(u) Τὸς μὲν ἔξω διοίκησιν ἐπισκόπους ταῖς ἑαυτῶν ἐπαρχείαις ἐκκλησίαις μὴ ἐπέναι, μηδὲ συγχέειν τὰς ἐκκλησίας, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τοὺς κανόνας τὸν μὲν Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐπίσκοπον τὰ ἐν αἰγύπτῳ μόνον οἰκονομεῖν; τοὺς δὲ τῆς ἀνατολῆς ἐπισκόπους, τὴν ἀνατολὴν μόνον διοικεῖν, φυλαττομένων δὴ ἐν τοῖς κανόσι τοῖς κατὰ νικαίαν πρεσβείων τῇ ἀντιοχέων ἐκκλησίᾳ, καὶ τοὺς τῆς Ἀσιανῆς διοικήσεως ἐπισκόπους τὰ κατὰ τὴν Ἀσιανὴν μόνον οἰκονομεῖν, &c. Φυλαττομένε δὲ τὰ προγεγραμμένα καὶ τὴν διοικήσεων κανόνα ἔυδηλον ὡς τὰ καθ' ἑκάστην ἐπαρχίαν ἡ τῆς ἐπαρχίας ζύνοδος διοικήσει τὰ νικαίᾳ ὡρισμένα. ——Ibid. Can. 165. sed Concilii lib. Can. 2.

the Asian *Dioceſs, ſhould govern the* Asian *Dioceſs only. And the Biſhops of the Dioceſs of* Pontus, *what appertaineth to that Dioceſs only; and ſo the Biſhops of* Thrace, *ſhould in* Thrace. *And that no Biſhop of any Dioceſs ſhould go except he be called to Ordination, or any other Church-diſpenſations. This Canon above written concerning Dioceſſes, being kept, it is manifeſt that thoſe things which appertain to each Province, ſhould be ordered by the Synod of that Province* (if they had ſaid, All, by the Biſhop of *Rome*, the Univerſal Head, it would have made their hearts to leap within them, and made his Holineſs ſmile; but alas! they carried it quite another way, by the Synod of the Province.) *according to the determinations of the* Nicene *Council.*-----(*w*) And in the next Canon they Decreed, *That the Biſhop of* Conſtantinople, *for as much as it is new* Rome, *ſhould have the badges of honour next to the Biſhop of* Rome. From this General Council we learn, firſt, That they vote againſt any one being Univerſal Head; becauſe, ſecondly, every Biſhop was to govern in his own Dioceſs, and no other was to meddle, except deſired, with any Eccleſiaſtical matters in anothers Province. Thirdly, that the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* is made equal with the Biſhop of *Rome*, ſave that his Worſhip (I ſhould have ſaid Lordſhip, but that they will not think high enough, but I cannot help it, theſe two Councils forbid me to ſay Head,) ſhould ſit in the firſt place, or before the other, which yet he might have done, without Univerſal Juriſdiction. Fourthly, we learn that this honour that they either had was not bottomed upon Divine Right, but becauſe they were Biſhops in the Imperial Cities; but here is not a word, *thou art Peter, &c. Peters* Succeſſor, *&c.* Apoſtolical Seat, *&c.* All this is very good evidence that the Pope is not ſo old as to reach to the times of this Council neither.

(*w*) Τὸν μὲν τοι Κωνσαντινουπόλεως ἐπίσκοπον ἔχειν τὰ πρεσβεῖα τῆς τιμῆς μετὰ τὸν τῆς ῥώμης ἐπίσκοπον, διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὴν νέαν ῥώμην. Ibid. Can. 166. aliter Can. 3.

Thirdly, the next Catalogue of Witneſſes that yet the Biſhop of *Rome* was not Univerſal Head conſiſts of two hundred Fathers, aſſembled in a General Council at *Epheſus* in the year 431, (ſo *Codex. Canon.*) Or as others 434, or thereabouts. This Council is ſo full, that I wonder how the Papiſts ſo many of them as have ſet forth ſo many Volums of Councils could with patience write what ſo much made againſt them, and yet go on in their error challenging Headſhip from the Apoſtles times. The Canon declareth the occaſion of its Conſtitution, in this manner, (*x*) Reginus *our fellow Biſhop, and beloved of God, together with*

(*x*) Πρᾶγμα παρὰ τὰς ἐκκλησιαστικὰς θεσμὰς καὶ τοὺς κανόνας τῆς ἁγίων καινοτομέμενον καὶ τὸ πάντων ἐλευθερίας ἁπτομένου προσηγγείλη, &c. Ὥστε τὸν ἐπίσκοπον τῆς Ἀντιοχέων πόλεως, τὰς ἐν κύπρῳ συνιέναι χειροτονίας, &c. Ἔξεσι τὸ ἀνενπρέασον καὶ ἀδίασον οἱ τῆς ἁγιών ἐκκλησιῶν καὶ τὸ κύρεον πρωεσῶτες καὶ τὰς κανόνας τῆς θσίων πατέρων καὶ τὶν ἀρχαίαν σωήθειαν, δι ἑαυτῶν τὰς χειροτονίας τῆς ἐυλαβεσάτων ἐπισκόπων ποιύμενοι, τὸ δε αὐτὸ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς ἄλλων διοικήσεων καὶ τῆς ἀπανλαχῆ ἐπαρχιῶν παρφυλαχθήσεται, ὥστε μηδένα τῆς θεοφιλεσάτων ἐπισκόπων ἐπαρχίαν ἑτέραν ἐκ ἔσαν ἄνωθεν καὶ ἐξαρχῆς ὑπὸ τὶν αὐτῆ, ἤγεν τῆς περὶ αὐτῆς χέρα, καλαλαμβάνειν, ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ τὶς κατέλαβεν καὶ ὑφ' ἑαυτῷ πεποίηται βιασάμενος τῆλον ἀποδιδέναι, ἵνα μὴ τῆς παλέρων οἱ καὶ ὁσις παραβαίνωνται, μὴ δὲ ἐν ἱερωσύνης προσχήματι, ἐξουσιάς κοσμικῆς τύρος παρισδύνται, &c. Codex. Can. Eccleſ. Univerſ. Can. 178. aliter Concil. Epheſ. Can. 8.

the

the holy Bishops of the Province of Cyprus, Zenon *and* Evagrius, *have declared to us a new thing, contrary to Ecclesiastical Laws, and Canons of the holy Fathers, and that which reacheth* [concerneth] *the liberty of all; wherefore since common diseases need the greater medicine, for as much as they do the more harm, the ancient custom not being followed*; to wit (this new thing was) *that the Bishop of* Antioch *had Ordained some in* Cyprus, *as some eminent for Religion coming to the holy Synod have both by writing and by their own words informed*; (wherefore it is decreed that) *the Presidents of the holy Churches in* Cyprus *shall have this, without detriment and violation of their right, according to the Canons of the holy Fathers, and the ancient custom, themselves to Ordain godly Bishops*; *and this also shall be observed in other Dioceſſes and Provinces every where, that no Bishop draw under his Subjection any other Province, which was not his from the beginning, or his Predeceſſors*; *and if any Bishop hath made such invasion, and by violation* [or wrong] *made it subject to him, he shall again restore it*; *that the Canons of the Fathers be not transgreſſed, left under pretence of Prieſthood the arrogance* [or swelling pride] *of worldly power creep in unawares, and we insensibly and by little and little lose that liberty which Jesus Christ our Lord, the Redeemer of Mankind, hath purchased for us with his own Blood, and given freely to us. It seemeth good therefore to this holy and general Synod, that the Rights which they have had from the beginning be secured to every Province, pure and inviolable, according to the ancient custom*; *every Metropolitan having liberty to take a copy of the Acts for his own security. And if any one shall take a Copy contrary in any thing to what is now determined, it pleased all the holy and Universal Synod that it should be void.* Thus far this General Council unanimously voted against one Bishops medling with, encroaching upon the Provinces of others; calling it a new thing, &c. How then was one Bishop owned as Head over all the reſt.

Fourthly, another Catalogue of six hundred and thirty (so *Caranza*,) assembled in a General Council at *Chalcedon* in the year 451; therein their first Canon ratifie and confirm all the Canons of the former Councils, so that by the vote of these, they to this year are against the Primacy and Soveraignty of any one Bishop. In another Canon they determined, (y) *That if any Clergy-man had any difference with his own, or another Bishop, it should be tried by the Synod of the Province*; *but if there were any controversie betwixt a Bishop, or Clergy-man, and the Metropolitan of the Province, he or they should go to the Dioceſan or to the seat of the Royal City of* Constantinople, *and there have it tried.* So then Appeals to *Rome* hereby are cut off; and the same is ratified again in another Canon of

(y) Εἰ δὲ κληρικὸς πρᾶγμα ἔχει πρὸς τὸν ἴδιον, ἢ κληρικὸς πρὸς ἕτερον ἐπίσκοπον παρὰ τῷ συνόδῳ τῆς ἐπαρχίας δικαζέσθω: εἰ δὲ πρὸς τὸν τῆς αὐτῆς ἐπαρχίας μητροπολίτην, ἐπίσκοπος ἢ κληρικὸς ἀμφισβητοίη, καταλαμβανέτω, ἢ τὸν Ἔξαρχον τῆς διοικήσεως, ἢ τὸν τῆς βασιλίδος κωνσταντινουπόλεως πρόεδρον, καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῷ δικαζέσθω. Codex Can. Eccleſ. Univerſ. Can. 187. item Can. 195.

the same Council. Again, they (z decreed, *That the Church of* Constantinople *should have equal priviledges with* Rome, *that as the Fathers before them had given the Priviledg to elder* Rome, *because it had the Empire, so being moved by the same reason they gave the same priviledges to* Constantinople, *new* Rome, *thinking it reason that the City which is honoured with the Empire and Senate should be alike advanced with old* Rome, *in all Ecclesiastical matters.* From whence it plainly follows, first, that what priviledg or precedency was given to *Rome*, was not by reason of *Peters* supposed Chair, but because it was honoured with Empire; so that in the judgment of the Ancients he had no Divine Right. Secondly, that the Bishop of *Constantinople* was equal with the Bishop of *Rome* in all things, as also were the Metropolitans of the *Asian*, *Thracian* Dioceses, and of *Pontus*, then at this time he was not yet Universal Bishop.

(z) Τὰ ἴσα πρεσβεῖα ἀπένειμαν τῷ τῆς νέας ῥώμης ἁγιωτάτῳ θρόνῳ εὐλόγως κρίνοντες τὴν βασιλείαν καὶ σὺν ἴσῳ λαύσασαν πρεσβείων τῇ πρεσβυτέρᾳ βασιλίδι ῥώμῃ, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς ὡς ἐκείνην μεγαλύνεσθαι πράγμασι &c Codex can. Eccles. Univers. Can. 206.

Fifthly. Another Evidence in this cause is the Council held at *Antioch* in the year 341, (so *Codex Canon.*) the occasion whereof was this: In the time of *Julius* the first, (a) Bishop of *Rome* in the Eastern Church several Bishops were Deposed for divers causes by their Synods; which Bishops went to *Rome*, acquainted *Julius* with their whole Estate and Trouble; *Julius* writeth to the Bishops of the East, telling them, *They had done very ill to determine and conclude any thing against those Bishops without his privity.* Which when they received, took the correction of *Julius* for a contumely, or slander, they summon a Council at *Antioch*, there assoon as they had assembled together, devised an Epistle by uniform consent of them all, wherein they bitterly inveigh against *Julius*, and signifie withal, *That if any were banished the Church, and Excommunicated by their Decree and Censure, it were not his part to intermeddle, nor to sit in judgment upon their sentence.* And did then Decree, (b) *That if any Bishop should be accused, and the matter could not be determined by the Bishops of the Province, some pronouncing the accused to be innocent, others to be guilty, for the taking up of the whole Controversie, the Metropolitan should call others to judg from the neighbouring Province, and what should be so determined should stand firm.* And in the next Canon, they did ratifie, *That if any Bishop was accused, and condemned by all the Bishops of the Province, and all should with one consent pronounce sentence against him; he should no more be tried by any other. But the sentence of*

(a) *Euseb.* Eccles. Hist. lib. 7. cap. 23, &c. & 36. *Socrat.* lib. 2. cap. 11.

(b) Εἰ τὶς ἐπίσκοπος ἐπὶ τισιν ἐγκλήμασι κείνοιτο, ἐπειτα συμβαίη μὴ αὐτῷ διαφωνεῖν τοὺς ἐν τῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ ἐπισκόπους, ἀλλ' μὲν ἀθῷον τὸν κρινόμενον ἀποφαινόντων πάντων, καὶ ἓνοχον, ὡσὲ ἀπαλλαγῆς πάσης ἀμφισβητήσεως ἔδοξε τῇ ἁγία συνόδῳ τὸν τῆς μητροπόλεως ἐπίσκοπον, ἀπὸ τῆς πλησιοχώρου ἐπαρχίας μεταπαλέσθαι ἑτέρους τινὰς τοὺς ἐπικριθήσεσθαι, καὶ τὴν ἀμφισβήτησιν διαλύοντας, τοῦ βεβαιῶσαι σὺν τοῖς τῆς ἐπαρχίας τὸ πεισάμενον. Codex Can. Eccles. Univers. Can 93. Εἰ τὶς ἐπίσκοπος ἐπὶ τισιν ἐγκλήμασι κατηγορηθεὶς, κριθεὶη ὑπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐν τῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ ἐπισκόπων, πάντες τὲ σύμφωνοι μίαν καὶ αὐτὴν ἐξενέγκοιεν ψῆφον, τοῦτον μηκέτι παρ' ἑτέροις δικάζεσθαι, ἀλλὰ μένειν βεβαίαν τὴν συμφωνον τῶν ἐπαρχίᾳ ἐπισκόπων ἀπόφασιν. Codex Can. Eccles. Univers. Can. 94. apud Caranz. & Surium, Concil. Antiochen. Can. 14, 15.

the

the Bishops of the Province should be to all purposes valid. Clearly do they take away all Appeals to *Rome*, as the matter of the Canons, and the occasion of making of them doth fully demonstrate. And this Council was confirmed in the sixth General *Constantinopolitan* Synod held in *Trul*, and by Pope *Dionysius*, and so hath the Authority of a General Council and Pope too, therefore with the Papists themselves should be authentick. *Caranz. Sum. Concil. p.*165. *Euseb. lib.*7. *cap.*24, *&* 25. *Surius Concil. Tom.*1. *pag.*399.

Sixthly. Another full Evidence that the Bishop of *Rome* was not owned as Universal Head is the stout opposition made against it (in their early aspiring after it) by *two hundred and seventeen Fathers* assembled, (*Augustine* being one, and *Aurelius* President) in the year 419, (so *Codex Can. Ecclesiæ Africanæ.*) The Controversie then was this. *Apiarius* a Priest in *Africa*, was for his scandalous life Excommunicated, in an *African* Synod, hereupon he fled to the Bishop of *Rome*, who absolved him, and commanded him to be restored to his place; and *Sozimus* Bishop of *Rome* to justifie this, claimed a right to receive Appeals from all parts of the World, and for proof thereof pretended a certain Canon of the *Nicene* Council that did give it him; the Council not finding any such Canon in the Decrees of the Fathers at *Nice*, sent away Letters and Messengers to the Bishop of *Constantinople*, *Alexandria* and *Antioch*, that they would send to them the Acts of the *Nicene* Council, fast closed and sealed up, because they could not find a Canon which was alledged by the Legats of the Bishop of *Rome*, from these they received several Copies, all agreeing, but in none of them what *Sozimus* had affirmed to be in them, that he was shamefully by all the Council convinced of forgery, that he did greatly err, they all proved; for the Copies taken out of the Originals by *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, and by *Atticus* of *Constantinople*, *&c.* had no such thing in them; and the whole Council writing to *Boniface*, (in which Letter they call *Sozimus* a man of unhappy memory,) desired him to repel those that made him their refuge, both because there is no such constitution of the Fathers, which hath at any time so much derogated from the Authority of their Churches, as also because the *Nicene* Council hath apparently left the ordering of all Inferiours to the judgment of their Metropolitan, and had determined that all matters of Controversie should receive their final decision in the place where they began; for how can a Judgment given beyond the Seas be good, where Witnesses necessarily required in such cases, cannot be present, either in regard of their sex, or age, or some other Impediment.---Because it is granted to every one to appeal to the Councils of their own Provinces, or to an Universal Council.------Unless there should be any one that can think that our God can inspire a justice of trial into any One man, and deny it to innumerable Priests that are assembled in Council; and much more these Letters of the Council to *Boniface*, of *Cyril* of *Alexandria* to the Council, and of *Atticus*:

ticus of *Constantinople* to the same, and the Copies of the *Nicene* Council sent to them, and the Epistle of the Council to Pope *Celestine*, are in the end of *Codex Canon. Eccles. African.* and in *Surius Tom.* 1. *p.*588. *&c.* Thus much for their Letters, now for the Canons of the *African* Church against the Headship of the Bishop of *Rome*. In the 19. Canon, *If any Bishop be accused, the accuser should bring his cause before the Primate of the Province.* Can. 23. *That no Bishop should go beyond the Sea, unless he had the consent of the Bishop of the first seat of every Province.* Can. 28. *That Presbyters* (c) *Deacons, and others, if they have complaint against their Bishops, the neighbouring Bishops should hear them, and if they would appeal from them, it should not be to the judgments of any beyond the Sea, but to the Primates of their own Provinces, or to a General Council, as was decreed before concerning Bishops, as for those that shall appeal beyond the Sea, none shall receive them into Communion in Africk.* So also Canon 125.

(c) Ὁμοίως ἤρεσεν, ἵνα οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ οἱ διάκονοι, καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ κληρικοὶ, ἐν αἷς ἔχωσιν αἰτίαις, ἐὰν τὰ δικαστήρια μέμφωνται τῶν ἰδίων ἐπισκόπων, οἱ γείτονες ἐπίσκοποι ἀκροάσωνται αὐτῶν: καὶ μὴ συναιρέσεως τὸ ἰδιὸ ἐπισκόπω, τὰ μεταξὺ αὐτῶν διαθῶσιν οἱ προσκαλούμενοι δὲ αὐτῶν ἐπίσκοποι, διὸ εἰ καὶ παρὰ αὐτῶν ἔκκλητον παρεχειν νομίσωσιν, μὴ ἐκκαλέσωνται εἰς τὰ πέραν τῆ θαλάσσης δικαστήρια, ἀλλα πρὸ τῆς προθέσεως τῶν ἰδίων ἐπαρχιῶν, ὡς καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἐπισκόπων πολλάκις ὤφεται οἱ ὑπὲρ τοιαυτικὰ δικαστήρια διεκκαλέμενοι, παρὰ ἀδένδς ἐν τῆ Ἀφεικῆ δεχθῶσιν εἰς κοινωνίαν. Codex Can. Eccles. African. Can. 28.

So far we see that the Church of God did curb and restrain the ambition of the Bishop of *Rome*, and stoutly stood against the invading endeavours of aspiring Antichrist. Yet will I add one more, (and so let the Councils pass for this head; that is, against the Universal Head,) and that is of a Council at *Constantinople*, in the time of *Agatho* Bishop of *Rome*, which was about the year 673, or as others 681, who did smartly snub (the pretended Mother, that is to give Laws to all others) by making a Law to reach as far, and to bind the Church of *Rome*, saying, (d) *For as much as we understand that in the City of* Rome *in time of Lent, they fast upon the Sabbath-days, contrary to the custom of the Church, it is decreed in this Synod, that also in the Church of* Rome, *that Canon shall be of force without violation, which saith, if any of the Clergy shall be found fasting on the Lords-day or Sabbath, except one and that only, let him be deposed, but if he be of the Laity, let him be Excommunicated.* This the Church of *Rome* in the heighth of their pride would hardly brook, but you see as far as this time reacheth, many Councils knew no such thing as an Universal Head, but opposed the first appearance of it.

(d) Quoniam intelleximus in Romanorum civitate, in sanctis quadrigesimæ jejuniis in ejus Sabbatis jejunare, præter Ecclesiasticam consuetudinem traditam; sanctæ Synodo visum est, ut in Romanorum quoque Ecclesia inconcusse vires habeat Canon qui dicit: Si quis clericus inventus fuerit in sancto dominico vel Sabbatho jejunans, præter unum & solum, deponatur, sin autem Laicus, segregetur. *Surius in Concil. Tom.*2. *p.*1048. *Concil. VI. Constant. Can.* 55. *refer. autem ad Canon. Apostol.*66.

To

To these Evidences fetched from Councils I shall add further the expressed judgment of two of their own Bishops, Predecessors of him, that first got the title of Universal Head, *Pelagius* and *Gregory* the Great, which two did so exceedingly inveigh against this title, God in his Providence so ordering it, that the following Popes might be condemned out of the mouths of their Predecessors; whose sharpness of speech against this Usurpation, was occasioned by *John* Bishop of *Constantinople*, surnamed the *Faster*, who did assume to himself the title of Universal Bishop about the year 580, about which time *Pelagius* the second being Bishop of *Rome*, did write to all the Bishops assembled at *Constantinople* in a Synod called by *John* the Bishop of that Seat, saying, "That "they ought not to acknowledg *John* as Universal Bishop, unless they "purposed to depart away from the Communion of all other Bishops: Moreover, saying, (*e*) "Let no Patriarch use to profane a Title, for if "the chief Patriarch should be called Universal, the name of a Patri-"arch should be taken away thereby from all others; but God forbid "it should ever enter into the heart of a Christian to assume any thing "unto himself, whereby the honour of his Brethren should be debased. "For this cause I in my Epistles never call any by that name, for fear lest "by giving him more than is his due, I might seem to take away that "which of right belongeth to him. For the Devil our adversary goeth "about like a roaring Lion, exercising his rage upon the humble and "meek-hearted, and seeking to devour now, not the sheep-coats, but "the very principal members of the Church.---------For he (*of whom he writes*) "cometh near unto him of whom it is written, *This is he which* "*is King over all the children of Pride:* Which words I speak with grief "of mind, seeing our brother and fellow-Bishop *John*, in despight (*mark his reasons against this Head.*) "of the Commandment of our Saviour, "the Precepts of the Apostles, and Canons of the Church, by this "haughty name, to make himself his (*Antichrists*) forerunner, and here-"by *John* goeth about (*mark Reader,*) to attribute to himself all those "things which belong properly to the Head himself, that is, Christ; "and by the Usurpation of this Pompous Title, to bring under his "Subjection all the Members of Christ.-----And that they ought to be-"ware lest this temptation of Satan prevail over them, and that they "neither give nor take this Title of Universal Bishop.

(*e*) Nullus Patriarcharum universalitatis vocabulo unquam utatur, quia si unus Patriarcha Universalis dicitur, Patriarcharum nomen cæteris derogatur; sed absit hoc, absit à fidelis cujusquam mente, hoc sibi vel velle quempiam arripere, unde honorem fratrum suorum imminuere ex quantulacunq; parte videatur, &c. *Jus Can. Dist. 99. c.* Nullus Patriarcharum, *Glos.*

This is a large Testimony against, and a full condemnation of both Name and Office of Universal Bishop, and this by a Bishop of *Rome*, before his Successor had usurped the same. And I might infer, either that the following Bishops of *Rome* do greatly err in taking to themselves this Name and Office, or else this Bishop of *Rome* was fallible and did err in a matter of Faith (made now by them necessary to Salvation) let them choose which they will (for one they must) their Principles are wounded by it.

After this *Pelagius* (for the Usurper was not immediately after him) suc-

succeeded *Gregory* called *the Great*, about the year 590, at which time *John* the fourth of *Constantinople* did still persist in claiming and maintaining his Title of Universal Bishop; at which *Gregory* being much grieved and offended, writes to *Constantia* the Empress against it: "Calling the exaltation of one man a defiling of that time, *(mark his reasons also,)* "saying far be it that your time should be defiled by the exaltation of one man; *termeth it the* crooked name of Universal *(f)* and an unsufferable thing, and that by this arrogancy and pride is portended "that the time of Antichrist is now at hand; and that *John* imitated "him, *(Lucifer)* who making light of that happiness which he had in "common with the other Angels, would needs aspire to a singularity above all the rest. *And to the Emperour writing, saith,* "That all those "who have read the Gospel know well that *Peter (mark, Reader,)* is not "called the Universal Apostle, and yet behold, my fellow-Priest *John* "seeketh to be called the Universal Bishop. I am now forced to cry out, "Oh the times! and Oh the manners of men! *Europe* is now exposed "for a prey to the Barbarian, and yet the Priests who should lie along "in the dust upon the pavement, weeping and rolling themselves in "ashes, do seek after names of vanity; and boast themselves of their "new-found *(this is a Novelty in the judgment of a Bishop of* Rome,*)* and "prophane Titles. And in opposition to this pride of *John* he was the first Bishop of *Rome* that took this Title, *the Servant of Servants*, which Title his Successors in feigned humility still use, though they usurp the Title of Universal Bishop, in opposition to which he did so stile himself, and in excessive pride have added to themselves since many pompous Appellations.----Again, saith the same *Roman* Bishop, "Now the King "of Pride is at the gates, and which I dread to speak, an Army of Priests "and Bishops stands ready to receive him; calls it a superstitious and "haughty name of Universal Bishop.----Never may such foolery befal "us; call an Universal Bishop *(very true,)* an Universal Enemy. And again, "I speak it boldly, that whosoever calleth himself, or desireth "to be called by others, the Universal Bishop, is in his Elation of mind, "the forerunner of Antichrist, because that in like Pride he preferreth "himself before others; Like, I say, for as that wicked One would seem "as God, above all men, so will this Man exalt himself above all Bishops. He plainly saith, "That none of the Bishops of *Rome* did ever assume "that word of Singularity, *&c.* And this same *Gregory* writing to *John*

(f) Triste tamen valde est, ut patienter feratur, quatenus despectis omnibus, prædictus frater & coepiscopus meus solus conetur appellari Episcopus. Sed in hac ejus superbia quid aliud nisi propinqua jam Antichristi tempora designatur? quia illum videlicet imitatur, qui spretis in sociali gaudio Angelorum legionibus, ad culmen conatus est singularitatis erumpere,—— Unde per omnipotentem dominum rogo, ne pietatis vestræ tempora permittatis unius hominis elatione maculari, neque tam perverso vocabulo ullum quoquo modo præbeatis assensum, &c. *Gregor. Mag. ad Constant. lib.* 4. *Epist.* 34. Cunctis Evangelium Scientibus liquet,—— quod *Petrus* Universalis Apostolus non vocatur, & vir sanctissimus consacerdos meus *Johannes* vocari Universalis Episcopus conatur; exclamare compellor, ac dicere, O tempora! O mores!—— & tamen Sacerdotes,—— vanitatis sibi nomina expetunt, & Novis ac prophanis vocabulis gloriantur, &c.—— Nullus *Romanorum* Pontificum unquam hoc singularitatis vocabulum assumsit, nec uti consensit, &c. Quis est iste, qui contra statuta Evangelica, contra Canonum decreta, Novum sibi usurpare nomen præsumit? *Idem, ibid. ad Mauritium. Epist.* 32.

of

of *Constantinople*, (*g*) deals roundly and plainly with him, saying, "When "thou wast called to the Office of a Bishop, thou saidst, That thou wert "not worthy to be called a Bishop, and now thou wouldest have none a "Bishop but thy self.------What wilt thou answer unto Christ, who is "the true Head of the Universal Church, in that day of Judgment, see-"ing that by this name of Universal thou seekest to enthral all the Mem-"bers of his Body unto thy self? whom dost thou imitate herein save "only him, who in contempt of those Legions of Angels, which were "his fellows, sought to mount aloft to the top of Singularity, where he "might be subject to none, and all others subject unto him?

(*g*) Qui enim indignum te esse fatebaris, &c. nec stulto ac superbo vocabulo appellari consentias, —— ut cuncta brevi cingulo locutionis astringam: sancti ante legem, sancti sub lege, sancti sub gratia, omnes hi perficientes corpus domini, in membris sunt Ecclesiæ constituti, & nemo se unquam Universalem vocare voluit, &c. *Idem ibid. ad Johan. Constantinop. Epist.* 38.

But did not he raise all this stir, and make all this opposition because *John* had prevented him because he had not this name and title himself, (*h*) since as he is said to *be the best of all the Bishops of* Rome *that came after him, so the worst of all that were before him.* Let alone what his heart and end was, and hear what he saith, writing to *Eulogius* Bishop of *Alexandria*, (*i*) "You have been careful to advertise me, that you for-"bear now to write unto any by those proud names which do spring "meerly from the root of vanity, and yet speaking to me, you say [as "you commanded], Let me I pray you hear no more of this word com-"mand; for I know well enough what I am, and what you are; in de-"gree you are my Brethren, and in manners you are my Fathers: where-"fore I commanded you nothing, only I advised you, what I thought "fittest to be done; and yet I do not find that you have perfectly ob-"served that which I desired to leave deepest graven in your remem-"brance; for I told you, that you should not write in any such manner "either to me, or to any other, and yet in the very Preface of your Epi-"stle, you call me by that name of pride and vanity, Universal Pope; "which I would entreat you to forbear hereafter, seeing that your selves "lose, whatsoever you give unduly to another. For my part I seek to "encrease in Virtues, and not in vanity of Titles; that addeth nothing "to my honour, which I see taken from my Brethren; my honour is "the honour of the Universal Church; and the sound vigor of my Bre-"thren.------For if you call me Universal Pope, you deny your selves to "be that which indeed you are, in that you call me Universal. But "God forbid, let us rather put far from us these words, which do puff "up to pride and vanity, and woundeth Charity to the death.

(*h*) Nunquid ego, hac in re piissime domine propriam causam defendo? nunquid specialem injuriam vindico? & non magis causam omnipotentis Dei & causam Universalis Ecclesiæ? *Idem ad Maurit. Epist.* 32.

(*i*) Indicare vestra beatitudo studuit, &c. Nam dixi nec mihi vos, nec cuiquam alteri tale aliquid scribere debere, & ecce in Præfatione Epistolæ, quam ad me ipsum qui prohibui, direxistis, superbæ appellationis verbum, Universalem me Papam dicentes, imprimere curastis. Quod peto dulcissima mihi sanctitas vestra ultra non faciat, &c. *Idem Epist. lib.* 7. *Epist.* 30. *Leg.* etiam ejusdem de eodem Epistolarum, *Lib.* 4. *Epist.* 36. & *Lib.* 6. *Epist.* 5. & 24. & 28. & 30. & 31.

This is that *Gregory*, Bishop of *Rome* that was so vehement in his writing against the name and office of Universal Bishop, that after his death the *Romanists* would have burnt his Works had not one *Peter* a Deacon restrained them by affirming to them, That he often saw the Holy Ghost in the form of a Dove sitting upon the head of *Gregory* while he was writing of them. This is that *Gregory* that so earnestly cried down an Universal Bishop, that Pope *Gregory* the *13th.* could not answer but by giving this *Gregory* the flat lie. *Plessæus.*

But what follows from that learned Authoritative confutation? but that the Bishop of *Rome* is fallible and may err; for if *Gregory* the Great did speak truth, then *Gregory* the thirteenth did speak false, in saying his Doctrine was a lie. If *Gregory* the thirteenth did speak true, in saying the other did lie and that in a matter of Faith made necessary to Salvation, then did *Gregory* the Great greatly err, in a matter that concerned the Universal Church. Let them take which they will, their Infallibility lyeth in the dust; for it will much puzzle his Holiness to reconcile the parts of a contradiction. Let him try his skill that both *Gregories* might in this be found true.

I have borrowed some Paper to be a little the larger in this, both from Councils, and in transcribing the words of these two, 1. *Because this is the Main HEAD and Hinge of our Controversies.* 2. *Because these two were their own, and yet against them.* 3. *Because it makes it plain that to six hundred years the Bishop of* Rome *was not Universal Head, for at that time it was disclaimed by themselves, as you see.* 4. Because the *English Reader* that understandeth not *Latin* Authors, might be satisfied from their own mouths that Universal Soveraignty of the Bishop of *Rome* is not so old as to come up so high as six hundred years after Christ.

But when was this Title first assumed? and by whom was it first conferred upon the Bishop of *Rome*, to be called Universal? that you might know when and how he got up into the Chair.

You have been told before that *Gregory* the Great did write Letters to *Maurice* the Emperour in the Controversie betwixt him and *John* of *Constantinople* about the name Universal. This Emperour *Maurice* falling into dislike among the Soldiers, one *Phocas* a Centurion made himself Captain of those that did mutiny, and was afterwards by them proclaimed Emperour; *Maurice* seeing this fled away with his Wife and Children. *Phocas* was Crowned, and pursueth after his own Master *Maurice*, overtakes him, slew his Wife and Children, or some of them before his eyes, and afterwards caused him to be murdered also. Mark that this *Phocas* was a vile Traitor, and a Murderer of such an excellent Emperour and virtuous Man, as Historians say, that *Maurice* was. A while after that *Phocas* was Emperour, *Gregory* that was Bishop of *Rome* and opposed the Title of Universal Head, departed out of this life, and *Sabinian* a malicious detractor of *Gregory* and his Works succeeded

ceeded him, and continued Bishop of *Rome* scarce two years, after whom succeeded *Boniface* the third, about the year six hundred and five, who lived not (as some say) above eight moneths, or as others but a year, after he was Bishop of *Rome*; but in that time he obtained what he aimed at; for the Murther committed by *Phocas* upon the Emperour *Maurice*, being not approved of by the Bishop of *Constantinople*, he seeking to establish himself in the Empire (gotten by blood) by the Friendship of the Bishop of *Rome*, *Boniface* making great offers of his service to *Phocas*, took this opportunity to desire of him that he and his Successors after him, should be called Universal Head of all the Churches of Christ, and that the Church of *Rome* thence forward should have the preheminence, and be Head of all other Churches; this murdering *Phocas*, and this aspiring *Boniface* agreeing to help one another, the Bishop to strengthen him in his Empire got by Rebellion; the Emperour *Phocas* quickly grants that he should be the Universal and head-Bishop over all Christian Churches. And this is acknowledged by their own Historians. (*k*)

(*k*) Quo tempore interceserunt quædam odiorum fomenta inter eundem *Phocam* Imp. atq; Cyriacum *Constantinopolitanum*. —— Hinc igitur in Cyriacum *Phocas* exacerbatus in ejus odium Imperiali edicto sancivit, nomen Universalis decere Romanam tantum modo Ecclesiam, tanquam quæ caput, esse omnium Ecclesiarum, solique convenire Romano Pontifici; non autem Episcopo *Constantinopolitano*, qui sibi illud Usurpare præsumeret. Quod quidem hunc *Bonifacium* Papam tertium ab Imperatore *Phoca* obtinuisse, cum *Anastasius* Bibliothecarius, tum *Paulus* diaconus tradunt. *Spondan*, *Epitom. Baron. Annal.* in Annum 606.

From all which you clearly see, first, that it was not till after the *sixth hundred* year from Christ that the Bishop of *Rome* had this Title conferred upon him. Secondly, that he came not *to it by divine right, not made so by God, nor called and chosen to it by a General Council of Fathers, but by a Traytor and a Murderer.* The Pope giving his help to keep the Usurper in the Saddle, by way of requital this wicked and Tyrannical Emperour lifts the Pope up into the Chair. A couple well (Oh no mischievously) met to do Offices for each other, but both eminently injurious to others by their Usurpations, the one in the State, the other in the Church.

As his Name and Office of Universal Bishop is new, so are those other accumulative, pompous, and some of them blasphemous Titles not fit to be given to any mortal man. For of old it was not so, for *Peter* whose Successor he pretends to be had no such Names nor Titles, but stiled himself a fellow Presbyter, 1 *Pet.* 5. 1. (*l*) And the Canons of the *African* Church of old were that the *Bishop of the first Seat* (that was *Rome*) *should not be called Prince of Priests, or head-Priest, or any such like name, but only the Bishop of the first Seat. Caranza* (*m*) in his Annotation upon this Canon, saith, That the *African* Church could not give

(*l*) Ὡσὲ ὁ τῆς πρώτης καθέδρας ἐπίσκοπον μὴ λέγεσθαι ἄρχον τῶν ἱερέων ἢ ἄκρον ἱερέα, ἢ τοιοῦτόν τι ποτε, ἀλλὰ μόνον ἐπίσκοπον τῆς πρώτης καθέδρας. Codex Canon. Eccles. Afric. Can. 39. (*m*) Caranz. Sum. Concil. Carthag. 3. Can. 26.

Laws to the Universal Church, and therefore by this Canon neither did nor could forbid the calling of the Bishop of *Rome*, Prince of Priests, &c. But they could Decree, That they would never call him so, nor own him for such, which shews that by them he was not so advanced. But their own Canon Law (*n*) forbids that the Bishop *of Rome should be called Universal*. And the sixth Council at *Constantinople* (*o*) ratifying the Decree of the 150 Fathers formerly assembled in that City, and of the 630 Fathers assembled at *Chalcedon*, did also agree with them and decree, That the Bishop of *Constantinople* should have equal Priviledg with the Bishop of *Rome*, and have equal Power in all Ecclesiastical matters with him, only that he be the second to the Bishop of *Rome*, and after the Bishop of *Constantinople*, the Bishop of *Alexandria* should have the next Seat, and next to him, the Bishop of *Antioch*, and next to him the Bishop of *Jerusalem*. By all which appears that the Bishop of *Rome* was not Head of all the rest, the Prince of Priests, but that all the respect that he had above the rest, was to sit down in the first Seat, which is nothing at all to his Universal Jurisdiction, and then he had not those Titles that now are given to him. 1. As Head over all Priests, as a King is over his Judges. 2. The Vicar of Saint *Peter*; though now they say not the Vicar of *Peter* properly, but Vicar of Christ properly and Successor of *Peter*. 3. Most mighty Priest. 4. That he hath all Laws in the chest of his breast. 5. Chief Magistrate of the whole World. 6. That his Sacerdotal dignity as far excelleth Kings and Emperours, as Gold excelleth Lead. 7. That all the Earth is his Diocess and he the Ordinary of all men, having the Authority of the King of all Kings upon Subjects. That he is all in all, and above all. 8. If those things that I do, be said to be done not of man but of God, what can you make of me but a God? and the Prelates of the Church being accounted of *Constantine* for Gods, I being above all Prelates by this reason am above all Gods.

(*n*) Nec etiam Romanus Pontifex Universalis est appellandus. *Distinct. 99. c.* nec etiam.

(*o*) *Surius* in Concil. Tom. 2. pag. 1046. Concil. *Constantinop.* Can. 36.

Jus Canonic. 1. Dist. 96. c. ego. c. *Constantinus.* 2. Distinct. 63. 3. Juris Canon. pars 2. caus. 25. quest. 1. c. null. 4. Romanus Pontifex, qui jura omnia in Scrinio pectoris sui censetur habere, ——Sexti. Decret. P. *Bonifac.* 8. c. licet. 5. Decret. lib. 6. *Bonifac.* 8. in Proœmio. 6. Distinct. 96. c. duo. 7. Glos. in c. 11. quest. 3. si mimicus. 8. Decret. de Translat. Episc. cap. quanto.

Likewise the Power of the Pope over General Councils is a new Power, it was not so of old; he had not the Power of calling Councils, but it did belong to, and was done by Civil Magistrates. The first General Council of *Nice* was assembled by the Authority of *Constantine* the Great; the Second at *Constantinople* was called by *Theodosius* the elder; the Third at *Ephesus* by *Theodosius* the younger; the Fourth at *Chalcedon* by *Valentinian* and *Martian*, &c. Historians tell us that when once the Emperours began to be Christians, from that time forward the Church-affairs depended upon them, and the greatest Councils were assembled, and so still are, at their appointment. (*p*) So *Socrates*. And the Council of *Constance*, (which *Caranza* (*q*) saith was General, and in the time of Pope *John* 24, which was after the year 1400, mark how lately, and

(*p*) Eccles. Hist. lib. 5. proœm.

(*q*) *Caranz.* Sum. Concil. p. 824, 825.

and did depose three Popes, *Gregory 12th*, *Alexander 5th*, *John 24th.*) and again in the Council of *Basil*, which began in the year 1431, (mark still how lately), in both these it was decreed, (r) *That a Synod hath its power immediately from Christ, which every one of what state soever or dignity he be; yea, even the Pope himself ought to be obedient, which if they be not, but shall contumaciously contemn the Decrees, Statutes, and Ordinances of the Council, except he repent shall suffer condign punishment, though it be the Pope himself.* And this Council of *Constance* was confirmed by Pope *Martin* the fifth, *Sess.* 45. and the other at *Basil* by Pope *Nicolas* the fifth.

(r) Primo declarat Synodus, — quod ipsa potestatem à Christo immediate habet, cui quilibet cujuscunque status vel dignitatis, etiamsi Papalis existat, obedire tenetur, &c. *Conc. Constan. Sess.* 4, 5. & *Conc. Basil. Sess.* 2. & 16. & 18.

By all this it doth appear that the main essential point of Popery is a meer Novelty, having not its original till after the sixth hundred year after Christ, and not got up to its full power till several hundred years after this. So that I may (as *Voetius* doth) confidently affirm, that in the first six hundred years, there was NO CHURCH, NO ONE DOCTOR, NO ONE MARTYR, NO CONFESSOR, NO ONE FAMILY, NO NOR ONE MEMBER OF THE CHURCH, NEITHER IN THE WEST, NOR IN ANY OTHER PART OF THE WORLD, THAT WAS PROPERLY AND FORMALLY A PAPIST. What is then become of the ANTIQUITY of POPERY? and this I bottom upon this foundation; because there cannot be so much as one [Formal] Papist, where the Essentials of Popery are not; as where the Essentials of a man are not, there is no man actually existent, but the Pope as Universal Head is the Essential part of the Popish Religion, without which (according to their Doctrine) the Church is no Church, nor any one a Member thereof that doth not own him and submit unto him. Therefore the Pope not being till after the sixth hundredth year, so long there was not one Papist (formally and properly) in the whole World.

This being the main Pillar of Popery I have insisted the longer to prove the Novelty of it; for this falling, the whole Fabrick tumbleth down: as therefore it is not necessary that I should be so large in the rest, so for want of more room and paper I must be constrained to contract and but name what follows.

Secondly. *The forbidding of Ministers Marriage is a meer Novelty.* For as their own (s) Authors say, *Syricius* Bishop of *Rome* that lived about the year 388, was the first that did forbid it; yet it was not then received and practiced as a duty for them to abstain from Marriage, but liberty of Marrying was never denied them till *Gregory* the 7. came to be Pope in the 1074, who yet was resisted, as one that brought in a new custom, never received before, and the Bishops of *Italy*, (t) *Germany* and *France* met together, and for this decreed that he had done against Christian piety, and deposed him, for that among other things he had divorced Men and their Wives, denying such as had their lawful Wives to be Priests; when yet at the same time he admitted to the Altars, Whoremongers, Adulters and Incestuous persons. *Bellar-*

(s) *Syricius* primus Sacerdotibus & Diaconis circiter annum salutis 388. conjugio interdixit, — non ante Pontificatum *Gregorii* 7, Ann. 1074, connubium adimi Sacerdotibus occidentalibus potuit. *Polyd. Virg. de Invent. rer. lib.* 5. *cap.* 4.

(t) *Magdeb. cent.* 11. pag. 389.

Bellarmine himself and other (u) Popish Doctors do grant, yea he proves by Arguments that by the Law of God it is not forbidden that Ministers should Marry, and that for many hundred years the Church of *Rome* permitted *Greek* Priests to have and dwell with their Wives.

(u) *Aquin.* 2da. 2dæ. Q. 88. art. 11. *Cajet.* Opuscul. Tom. 1. Tract. 27. Sotus lib. 7. de Justitia Q. 6. art. 2. in *Bellar.* de cleric. lib. 1. cap. 18.

Thirdly. *That Religious worshipping of Images hath not been of old in the Church of God, nor received and owned by Councils,* (for what particular persons and hereticks in this point have done is not in this Controversie so much to be minded) *nor practised in the Church for some hundred years after Christ, there is sufficient evidence.* Bishop *Usher* in his Answer to the Jesuits Challenge, saith, It might well be concluded that Images were brought into the Church partly by lewd Hereticks, partly by simple Christians newly converted from Paganism. The Gnostick Hereticks had Images, some painted in Colours, others framed of Gold and Silver, and other matter, which they said were the representations of Christ, made under *Pontius Pilate*, when he was conversant here among men; and though *Eusebius* (w) makes mention of the Images of *Paul and Peter, and of Christ, yet there he calls it an Heathenish custom.* But they were so far from worshipping them in the Primitive times, that a Council (x) of ancient Fathers did decree about the year 325, *That Pictures ought not be in the Church, lest that which is worshipped or adored should be painted on walls.* Which Law made by this Council, set *Melchior Canus* (y) the Papist in such an heat, that he alone would condemn all them not only of imprudency but impiety for so doing, for the poor man could not otherwise answer it.

(w) *Euse.* Eccl. Hist. l. 7. c. 18.

(x) Concil. *Elibertin.*

(y) Illa lex non imprudenter modo, verum etiam impie, à Concilio *Elibertino* lata est de tollendis imaginibus. *Canus* loc. Theolog. lib. 5. cap. 4. concluf. 4.

In the first four General Councils there is nothing for the worshipping of Images, which reached to the year 451, and yet if they had been of that opinion they had had occasion from what was done in the *Elibertine* Council, being about the same time that the *Nicene* Council was, and before the other three.

And it should seem that they were not worshipped in the Church of *Rome* it self for six hundred years after Christ, by the Epistle of *Gregory* the Great to *Serenus* Bishop of (z) *Marseilles*, who had broken down Images, and cast them out of his Church, when he perceived some to begin to dote upon them too much, *whom though he reproves for breaking of them, yet him he commends for his Zeal, that nothing made with hands should be worshipped.----you ought to restrain the people from worshipping of them, that though the people might have had them, whereby to gather the knowledg of the History, but might not sin in worshipping the Picture.* Judg if it were likely that at that time Religious Worship was given to Images at *Rome*, when the Bishop thereof condemned it for a sinful thing, and commends others for being against it. And though Cardinal *Bellarmine* was of opinion, *That it is lawful to picture God in the Church in the shape*

(z) Indico dudum ad nos pervenisse quod fraternitas vestra quosdam Imagium adoratores aspiciens, eas dem Ecclesiæ Imagines confregit atque projecit, & quidem zelum vos, ne quid manu factum adorari possit, habuisse laudavimus. —— Tua fraternitas, —— ab earum adoratu populum prohibere debuit; —& populus in Picturæ adoratione minime peccaret. *Greg. Mag. Epist. lib. 7. Ep. 109.*

of

of a man, and the Holy Ghost in the form of a Dove, yet a greater and one more ancient than he was against it, namely, Pope *Gregory* the second, *(a)* whose Epistle is related by *Baronius* upon the year 726, whence it seems there was no such Picture in the Church of *Rome* at that time, for saith that Pope, *In the Church God is not represented before mens eyes, and that the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is not drawn in colours, because Gods nature cannot be painted out, or put in sight.*

Moreover at a Council of 338 Fathers held at *Constantinople* in the year 754, they were solemnly condemned; and when they were set up by the second Council at *Nice* in the year 787, were degraded again of their honour by the Council of *Francfort* in the year 794.

(b) Durant purposely sets himself to give us all the Councils that have approved the use and veneration of Images; and saith, the first that did was the sixth Council at *Constantinople* (which was in the time of Pope *Agatho* about the year 673), and quotes the 83, but it is the 82 Canon, (c) where the Picture of Christ is commanded to be made in the shape of a Man, but turning to the place I find plainly that this Canon doth not at all command any Worship to be given to it, but only as Historical, that is nothing to the Popish cause of worshipping of them. Another (saith he) is a second *Nicene* Council, which yet was 787 years after Christ, so that this might pass for a Novelty.

(a) Cur tandem patrem domini Jesu non oculis subjicimus ac pingimus? quoniam quis sit non novimus, Deique natura spectanti proponi non potest ac pingi.

(b) Durant. de ritib. p. 31.

(c) Christi Dei nostri instar hominis characterem etiam in Imaginibus deinceps proveteri agno statuimus jubemus, ut per ipsum verbi Dei humiliationem mente comprehendentes, ad memoriam quoque ejus in carne conversationis, ejusque passionis, & salutaris mortis deducamur, ejusque quæ ex eo facta est mundo Redemptionis. *Conc. Constant. VI. Can.* 82.

Fourthly. *The Doctrine of Purgatory*, by the confession of Papists themselves is ranked among the Novelties brought into the Church; for one of them saith, *(d) No true Believer now doubts of Purgatory, whereof notwithstanding among the ancient there is very little or no mention at all. The* Greeks *also to this day do not believe that there is a Purgatory; let who will read the Commentaries of the ancient* Greeks, *and so far as I see, he shall find very rare speech of Purgatory, or none at all. And the* Latins *did not all of them together receive the truth of this matter, but by little and little; neither indeed was the faith either of Purgatory or Pardons so needful in the Primitive Church, as now it is.* Thus far a Papist, and an ingenuous one too, which is rare to find, that will without Partiality speak the truth. Which *Bellarmine* doth not use to do, for he saith quite contrary, *That all the Fathers (e) both* Greek *and* Latin *have constantly taught from the Apostles times that there is a Purgatory.* And this Cardinal is in such a heat for Purgatory-fire, that he saith, *That it is a Doctrine of Faith, so that he that doth not believe it, shall never come to it,* (no harm if he do not, I suppose it is no desirable thing to be in pains no less than the pains of Hell, though shorter,) *but shall be always tormented in the flames of Hell.* But the best of it is, that it is but a Cardinal, not the Scripture that saith so. But I will set another Papist upon *Bellarmines* back, and standing

(d) Nemo certe dubitat Orthodoxus, an Purgatorium sit, de quo tamen apud Priscos, nulla vel quàm rarissima fiebat mentio; sed & Græcis adhuc usque diem, non est creditum esse, &c. *Johan. Roff.* apud *Polyd. Virg. de invent. rerum, lib. 8. cap.* 1.

(e) Bellar. de Purgat. lib. 1. cap. 15.

standing betwixt the two let him shift for himself, and get out as well as he can, they are the words of *Alphonsus*; *(f) Concerning Purgatory there is almost no mention made by the Ancients, especially the* Greek *Writers, for which reason to this very day the* Greeks *do not believe that there is a Purgatory.* It is true that many of the Fathers speak of a Purging-fire, both in this life, and after; but by the Purging-fire in this life they understand afflictions. So *Augustine*, *(g) We confess that in this life there are Purgatory pains,---- as loss of friends, and the calamities of this life.* So also of a Purging-fire after this life, through which they make all Saints to pass; by which fire they understand, the last day of Judgment; but the Popish Purgatory is another thing, not invented in the days of *Gregory* the first, who did write in the end of the sixth age, saying, *(h) Because we are redeemed by the Grace of our Creator, so much we have of heavenly gift, that when we are with-drawn from the habitation of our flesh, we are presently brought to the heavenly recompence.* And though in the Writing of this Pope there is some mention of Purgatory for smaller Sins, yet it is not the same that the Papists now assert; for in his Dialogues he speaks of the Purgation of Souls in Baths, in Rivers, and Wind; and it was first bottomed upon Visions and Revelations, and fained Stories of departed Souls appearing to others in this life, two of which I had Translated, but I find they are too large for want of room) to be inserted; the one is to be found in *(i) Gregories* Works, the other in *(k) Bedes* History in the year 671, and both in the *Magdeburgenses.*

But above 200 years after these pretended Visions, the Council of *Aquisgran (m)* do shew that this was not a general received Doctrine, who shew how men are punished after this life; for they sum up all the punishments inflicted by God for sin to this life, and they mention two ways, but the *third* (say they) *after this life, is very fearful and terrible, which by the most just judgment of God shall be executed, when he shall say, depart from me ye cursed into everlasting fire, prepared for the Devil and his Angels.* And yet further, to discover the Novelty of Purgatory, that it was above a thousand years but the opinion of some particular men, and not an article of Faith generally received; the saying of *Otto Frigensis (n)* writing in the year of our Lord 1146, giveth evidence: his words be these; "That there is in Hell a place of Purgatory, wherein such as "are to be saved are either only troubled with darkness or de-"cocted with the fire of Expiation, SOME do AFFIRM, *(mark Reader)*, all did not teach so, nor the most; "Nor, saith he, many, but "some only.

Fifthly. *That the Popes Indulgences are a meer Novelty*, that the Church of God for many hundred years knew nothing of; we need look no further evidence than the plain confession of Papists themselves, amongst whom I find *Alphonsus* making plain and full confession, about these Indulgences and Popes Pardons, saying, "*That of all the matters treated of in his whole Book, there is not one that the Scripture is more silent in, not*

one

(f) Alphons. de Castro, adverss. hæres. lib 8. titul. Indulgentia.

(g) August. de civitat. Dei, lib. 22. cap. 13.

(h) Quia authoris nostri gratia redempti sumus, hoc jam cœlestis muneris habemus, ut cum à carnis nostræ habitatione subtrahimur, mox ad cœlestia præmia ducamur. *Gregor.* 1. in Job 20.

(i) Gregor. lib. 4. Dialog. cap. 55.

(k) Bed. Eccl. Histor. lib. 5. cap. 13.

(l) Magdebur. Centur. 6. pag. 693. Cent. 7. pag. 573, 574.

(m) Capit. *Aquisgran.* Conc. ad Papinum Miss. lib. 1. cap. 1. quoted by Bishop *Usher.* Answ. to Jes. Chall. p. 177.

(n) Esse apud inferos locum Purgatorium, in quo salvandi vel tenebris tantum afficiantur, vel expiationis igne decoquantur, QUIDAM asserunt. *Otto Frig.* lib. 8. Chro. c. 26. apud eundem.

one that the ancient Writers speak less of. (*o*) Though he would not have them *therefore to be slighted, because the use of them hath been but lately received, because* (mark what he saith,) *many things are known to posterity, which the ancient Writers were altogether ignorant of. What need we wonder then, if this be so in the matter of Indulgences, that among the Ancients there is no mention of them at all?* really this did me good to read, for I love and like that men should be ingenuous, and speak the plain truth. Yet when I read further, and saw that he doth acknowledg nothing for it in the Scripture, nor in the ancient Fathers; yet that those that *set light by them, or despise them, should be judged hereticks*, I thought 'twas too much heat in him. This Papist makes no attempt at all to go higher than Pope *Gregory* the first, in the latter end of the sixth age, when (he saith) *It is said that he granted some Indulgences*; and from thence he slides as far as the *Lateran* Council, which was in the year of our Lord 1215, (so *Caranza*,) and from thence to the Council of *Constance* under Pope *John* 24, which was after the year of our Lord 1400. So late; and this is all the Antiquity that he doth pretend unto, from whose confession we might safely place this among the young Doctrines and practices held and used in the Church of *Rome*.

But let us try another of them whose business in his Book is to give the first rise, and beginning of things. (*p*) He also attempts not to rise higher than the sixth hundredth year, to the former *Gregory*; but there he finds little to fasten upon, and therefore steps presently back to *Boniface* the 8, who he saith was the first that brought in the Popish Jubilee, when he gave Pardons to those that visited the Apostles Temples, in the year 1300, which Jubilee he commanded should be observed every hundredth year. But when fifty years were almost expired, Pope *Clement* the sixth ordained this Jubilee should be every Fifty year, for as much as mans age would not reach the hundredth year. Lastly, Pope *Sixtus* the fourth (about 1471,) or as my present Author 1475, brought it to every 25. year; and *then* (I pray thee Reader mark) *the use of Pardons, which they call Indulgences, began to be famous, which Pardons for what cause, or by what authority they were brought in, or what they be good for, doth much trouble our Modern Divines to shew.* Reader, is not this a plain case? can we desire clearer evidence of the Novelty of the Popes Pardons, by which he beguiles so many Souls, and gets so much money in-

(*o*) Inter omnes res de quibus in hoc opere disputamus, nulla est quam minus aperte sacræ literæ prodiderint, & de qua minus vetusti Scriptores dixerint, neq; tamen hac occasione sunt condemnandæ [Indulgentiæ] quod earum usus in Ecclesia videatur sero receptus: quoniam multa sunt posterioribus nota, quæ vetusti illi Scriptores prorsus ignoraverunt.—— Quid ergo mirum si ad hunc modum contigerit de Indulgentiis, ut apud priscos nulla sit de eis mentio? —— Etsi pro Indulgentiarum approbatione sacræ Scripturæ testimonium apertum desit, tamen qui

contemnit, hæreticus merito censeatur, &c. *Alphons. de Castro adver. hæres. lib.* 8. *titul. Indulgentia.*

(*p*) *Bonifacius* octavus.—— primus omnium Jubileum retulit, anno qui fuit Mccc salutis humanæ, quo pœnarum remissionem iis præstabat, qui limina Apostolorum visitâssent.—— Idem autem Pontifex Jubileum centesimo quoq; anno servari mandavit.—— Quinquagesimo post instante anno *Clemens* sextus sanxit Jubileum quinquagesimo quoque anno, cum ætas hominis vix Jubileum illum centum annorum attingere posset.—— Postremo *Sixtus* ejus appellationis quartus Jubileum ad vigesimum quemque annum reduxit, primusque celebravit, qui fuit annus MccccLXXV salutis, ac ita veniarum quas Indulgentias vocant, jam tum usus celebris esse cæpit, quæ qua de causa, quave ex authoritate introductæ fuerint, aut quantum valere videantur, nostri recentiores Theologi ea de re egregie laborant; ego vero originem, quod mei est muneris, quæritans, non reperio ante fuisse, quod sciam, quam divus *Gregorius* ad suas stationes id præmii propositurit. *Polidor. Virgil. de Invent. rerum lib.* 8. *cap.* 1.

to his treasure; and being so much in the dark himself, he consults another to seek relief; and the third saith, (q) *It may be many will put no great trust to these Indulgences, because their use is but lately come into the Church, and is so found but a little while ago, to whom I say, it is not certain who first began them,* (and he can, doth, go no higher than the sixth hundred year, and then he speaks sparingly,) there was SOME *use of them, and doubtingly, for he gathers it only by consequence.* But this Popish Author whom before we cited, confessing the Novelty of Purgatory, doth also himself conclude, from thence follows the Novelty of Popish Pardons; for saith he, (r) *As long as there was no fear of Purgatory no man sought Indulgences, for all the account of Indulgence depends on Purgatory. If you deny Purgatory, what need of Indulgences? Indulgences began after men were frighted with the pains of Purgatory.* Thus out of the mouths of these three Witnesses of their own we might let this pass for one of the younger sort, and set it amongst its fellows.

(q) Multos fortasse movet Indulgentiis istis non usq; adeo fidere, quod earum usus in Ecclesia videatur recentior, & admodum sero apud Christianos repertus, quibus ego respondeo, non certo constare à quo primum tradi cæperint, fuit tamen, non-nullus earum usus, ut aiunt, apud Romanos vetustissimus, quod ex stationibus intelligi potest. —— (r) Quamdiu nulla fuerat de Purgatorio cura, nemo quæsivit Indulgentias, nam ex illo pendet omnis Indulgentiarum existimatio. Si tollas Purgatorium, quorsum Indulgentiis opus erit? Cæperunt igitur Indulgentiæ, postquam ad Purgatorii cruciatus aliquandiu trepidatum est. *Johan. Roffen.* in *Luther*, ibid.

6. The *like I may conclude of Prayer for the dead*; for if Purgatory be but a late device, and Indulgences granted for their deliverance be but late, prayer for them to be delivered out of Purgatory, (which is supposed in the manner of the Papists prayers for departed Souls) cannot be of a longer standing, as their Bishop before quoted did rightly argue.

What might be alledged for the Antiquity of praying for the Dead, used indeed in the Church formerly, is nothing to the Popish prayers used now; for it is most evident, that they did not pray in relation to their being in Purgatory which they understood not, nor do their prayers express any such thing, but rather the contrary of their being at rest, which they could not have in Purgatory; therefore whatsoever prayers they were, or to what end, is not my work at present to enquire, till they be proved to be such as Popish prayers for the Dead be, their praying in this sort for them will stand still among the younger practices of the Church of *Rome.*

7. As *for the Novelty of praying to Saints*, Cardinal *Du-Perron* (a man that would have found it, if there had been any such practice in the Primitive Churches) doth freely acknowledg (as *Molinæus* that traced him in his Book affirmeth,) that *as in the holy Scriptures there is neither command nor example for the Invocation of Saints, so likewise in the writings of the Fathers, that have written before the first four Councils* (which brings us to the year 451.) *no trace is to be found of that Invocation.* The distinction betwixt the Saints Intercession, and the Invocation of Saints should be carefully heeded; for whether the Saints in Heaven pray for the

Molin. de Novelt. of Popery, pag. 388.

the Church on Earth, and whether the Church on Earth might pray to the Saints in Heaven, are widely differing; that in the first ages it was accounted Idolatry to invocate Angels was determined in the 35 Canon of the *Laodicean* Council before quoted.

8. To *shew the Novelty of Transubstantiation*; that the substance of the Bread is not turned into the substance of the flesh of Christ, I need not stand long: for *Scotus* doth it for me, who saith, *That this was not a Doctrine of Faith before the* Lateran *Council, which was in the year* 1215, (*s*) Which *Bellarmine* taketh notice of and is offended at, and helps the matter as well as he can, in mentioning one Council, (and he names no more, which he would have done doubtless if any had been) and that is a Council at *Rome* under *Gregory* the 7, who was Pope in the year 1073; so that with *Bellarmines* grave admonition of *Scotus*, it was above a thousand years before that was made a Doctrine of Faith in the *Roman* Church it self. (*t*) But *Alphonsus* as to Councils rises no higher than the *Lateran*, according as *Scotus* did.

9. The *denying of the Cup to the People might be reckoned with the rest, for a meer Novelty*, having its rise in the Council of *Constance* which began in the year 1414, and there needs no other evidence, that this is an Innovation, than the very words of the Canon, whereby it is denied to the People, which are, (*u*) *Although Christ did administer this Sacrament in both kinds, and though in the Primitive Church the People did receive it in both kinds, yet this custom is rationally introduced,-----that the People shall only take the Bread,-----and we command under pain of Excommunication that no Presbyter give it to the People under both kinds of Bread and Wine.* See Reader, though Christ appointed both, though the Primitive times observed both, yet these say they shall have but one, any thing in Christs command, and the Churches practice for so many hundred years to the contrary notwithstanding; for this it was called deservedly by one *Concilium Non-obstantiense*, instead of *Constantiense*.

The practice of the Church of *Rome* decreed by this Council is but two hundred and odd years standing; and yet after this the Council of *Basil* granted the use of the Cup to the *Bohemians*; and again the Council of *Trent* denied it; so that Popish Councils can say and unsay, do and undo, and that in matters of Faith. where dissenters must be Hereticks, and yet cannot err, and that's pity.

10. The *Adoration of the Sacrament was after the Doctrine of Transubstantiation*; for the reason of their worshipping of it, is because it is changed into Christs Body and Blood; the first then being new, the other cannot be old; the first brought in as an Article of Faith in the time of *Innocent* the third 1215, the worshipping of it in the time of *Honorius* (*w*) the third in the year 1216. Behold its Antiquity!

11. The *practice of the Popes canonizing of Saints is a new invention by the confession of* Bellarmine *himself*, (*x*) who acknowledg that the first Pope that he ever read of was *Leo* the third, 800 years after Christ. And the same Cardinal saith, That no Saints might be publickly Invocated

(*s*) *Bellar.* de Euchar. lib. 3. cap. 23.
(*t*) *Alphons. de Castro* adver. hæres. tit. Euchar. heres.
(*u*) Licet Christus post cænam instituerit, & suis discipulis administraverit sub utraque specie panis & vini hoc venerabile Sacramentum, & similiter licet in Primitiva Ecclesia hujusmodi Sacramentum reciperetur à fidelibus sub utraq; specie, tamen hæc consuetudo ad evitandum aliqua pericula & scandala, est rationabiliter introducta, ——— quod à laicis tantummodo sub specie panis suscipiatur, &c. *Concil. Constan. Sess.* 13.
(*w*) Decret. *Greg.* IX lib. 3. tit. 41. cap. 10.
(*x*) Primus Pontifex (ni forte fallor) qui sanctos legatur Canonizasse, videtur fuisse *Leo* Papa III, antequam fortasse fuerunt aliæ. sed non mihi constat. *Bellar.* de sanct. Beat. lib. 1. cap 8.

that are not Canonized by the Pope, put both together, and it will make a clear consequence, that Invocation of Saints at least publickly was not for 800 years after Christ, the Papists themselves being Confessors.

But whither do I tend? to run over all Particulars controverted betwixt us and them would sooner swell into a Volumn, than be contained in a Sermon; I can therefore but name some other Points, and let it be shewn that for five, six, seven hundred, yea some for a thousand years after Christ, that they were generally owned or received in the Church of Christ, such as these added to the former.

12. The Infallibility of the Bishop of *Rome*.

13. That the Church of *Rome* is the only Church, founded by God himself, or that the Church of *Rome* is the Catholick Church.

14. That there is no Salvation out of the *Roman* Church.

15. That all that the Church of *Rome* delivers is to be believed, whether it be written in the Word of God or no.

16. That the Pope or Ch. of *R.* hath Power & Authority to make Doctrins of Faith, necessary to Salvation, that are not contained in the Scripture.

17. That the Pope of *Rome* alone, or his Council alone, or Pope and Council together are the Judg of Controversies, to whom Appeals from all the Churches must be made, and all bound to acquiesce in their, or his Determinations.

18. That the Pope of *Rome* might judg all but be judged by none, nor be blamed though he leads Souls by troops to Hell.

19. That the Pope of *Rome* hath Temporal Jurisdiction over Princes, Kings and Emperours, to depose them from their Thrones, dispose of their Crowns, and absolve their Subjects from their Oaths of Allegiance to their lawful Princes.

20. That the Pope of *Rome* hath Authority to dispense with the Law of God, to make that lawful which God forbids, and that evil which God commands.

21. That the Power of calling General Councils is inherent in the Pope.

22. That the Pope by himself, or Legats ought to be President in such Councils.

23. That all that General Councils do determine without his Authoritative Ratification, is of no force, but void.

24. That the Scripture is imperfect and insufficient, containing in it not all things necessary to Salvation, nor for the refuting of all Heresies.

25. That it is not lawful to interpret Scripture contrary to the sense of the Church of *Rome*.

26. That the Church doth not depend upon the Scripture, but the Authority of the Scripture, even *quoad nos*, upon the testimony of the Church of *Rome*.

27. That the Scripture ought not to be Translated into the Vulg. Tong.

28. That the common People are to be debarred from reading of the Scriptures except they have a License from the Bishop.

29. That the publick Service and Prayers in the Church ought to be in an unknown Tongue.

30. That

30. That there are seven proper Sacraments, Baptism, Confirmation, Lords-Supper, Penance, Extream Unction, Matrimony, Ordination: Or that there are eight Sacraments of Order, as the Order of Porters, Readers, Exorcists, Servitors, Sub-Deacons, Deacons, Presbyters and Bishops; to make indeed fourteen or fifteen Sacraments.

31. That the Sacrament of Confirmation is more worthy than the Sacrament of Baptism, and is to be had in greater reverence, and accordingly to be done only by a Bishop, when Baptism by a Presbyter.

32. That private Masses are lawful, and in them both Clergy and Laity to be deprived both of the Bread and Wine, except the Priest that makes it, by the rest only to be seen.

33. That the Eucharist when it is sent unto the Sick is to be adored by all that meet it, and those that do not, to be accounted Hereticks, and to be persecuted with Fire and Sword.

34. That it is a Sacrifice for the Quick and Dead, for obtaining not only Spiritual but Temporal Blessings, to be offered to God for Health, success in Battels, for their Horses and their Hogs.

35. That a justified person may truly and properly make satisfaction to God for the guilt of punishment, which remains to be expiated after the fault is remitted.

36. That the satisfactory Works of the Saints may be communicated and applied to others, or that there are Works of Supererogation.

37. That Absolution by a Priest is so necessary to Salvation, that persons believing in Christ are damned if they die before they be absolved by a Priest.

38. That the Confirmation of Bishops, and Institution of Arch-Bishops by the Pall is to be sought by the Pope of *Rome*, from all parts and quarters of the World, without which they are no such Officers, and cannot without Sacriledg execute their Office.

39. That in Baptism there is an Implicite Vow of Obedience to the Pope of *Rome*.

40. That the Decret. Epist. are to be reckoned amongst Can. Scripture.

41. That the Bishop of *Rome* if he be Canonically ordained, whatsoever he were, is undoubtedly made holy by the Merits of St. *Peter*.

42. That every transgression of the Law deserveth not death, but that there are many sins of themselves and in their own nature venial and deserving pardon, that the Blood of Christ is not necessary to wash them away, but may be done away with holy Water, knocking the breast, and by the Bishops blessing.

43. That Clergy-men are exempted from the Jurisdiction of Temporal Lords in things Civil and Criminal, and that the Civil Judg cannot punish Ecclesiastical persons.

44. That the Rebellion of a Clergy-man against the King is not Treason, or that it is meritorious to kill Princes Excommunicated by the Pope.

45. That good Works in themselves have a proportion, and condignity with the reward, and are meritorious from their inward worthiness,

to

to be worth the reward, as a Journey-man is of his wages for his labour. Papists themselvs do acknowledg that the first beginning of some of their Doctrines they cannot tell, and to search for the year when every Novelty was introduced is needless, all these that are named, are not in Scripture, nor in the Primitive Church, some not for 4, 5, some not for 6, 7, 8, 9, 12 hundred years, that I might conclude that Popery is a very Novelty, and doth vainly and falsly boast of its Antiquity.

I. *Use.* 1. Is Popery a new Way, and the Religion of Protestants the old Religion taught by Christ and his Apostles, then this is *a safe Way, and a safe Religion*; in it you may be justified, sanctified, and surely saved. It is the old Way that *Paul*, and *Peter*, and Believers in the Primitive times obtained an everlasting Kingdom and Crown. Be not frighted with the uncharitable and groundless Doctrine of the Papists, that *out of their Church there is no Salvation.* 2. *Then it is the wisest Way*; the folly of men shews it self in the new Ways of Popery, and wherein they profess themselves to be wise, they are become fools; but in the old Way is manifest the manifold Wisdom of God. 3. Then it is *the purest Way*; the nearer the Fountain the purer are the Streams; the nearer the Copy the fairer is the Writing; the Church of *Rome* doth vainly glory in Titles of Holiness; *the most holy Pope*; *the holy Church*; *the multitude of Holy Days*, *holy Rites and Ceremonies*, *&c.* that is holy and pure, that is consonant to the holy and pure Word of God. If you are to travel you would go the cleanest way; you are travelling to an everlasting state, the old Way of Faith in Christ, Repentance for Sin, inward Holiness and new Obedience taught in the Reformed Churches, agreeable to the Doctrine of Christ, and his Apostles, is the cleanest Way that you can go in, to keep a clean and pure Heart, a clean and pure Conscience, to have a clean and pure Conversation. 4. It is *the nearest Way*; if you leave this Way, the further you go, the more you are out of your Way. You go about, you must back again, or you go on to a place where there is no rest night nor day, but the smoke of their torment ascendeth for ever and ever. 5. Then it is the *most comfortable and most pleasant Way*; all the Ways of Wisdom are Ways of pleasantness, and all her Paths are peace. It might be strowed with outward troubles, briars and thorns may be in this Way, but there is inward peace, and inward joy, and solid, sure and lasting comfort to be found in it. 6 *Then it is the only Way*; The Way of Faith in Christ, the Way of Regeneration and Holiness, the Way of new Obedience and Perseverance therein is the old Way to Heaven, and there is no other. If you will choose new Ways your selves, or walk in new Ways chalked out by others, contrary to the good old Way, you will lose God and Christ, and your Souls for ever.

II *Use.* 1. *Get a right understanding of the greatness of your mercy*; that you were not born in times and places of Popery, that you have Ministers to teach you the good old Way, & Magistrates to defend you therein; that you are not burned at a Stake for not receiving new Popish Doctrines; that you have Bibles, and not burned for having of them. Know

your

your mercy. 2. *Bless God for this mercy*, when you understand how great it is; Indeed when you rightly know it, and duly weigh it, you will bless God that you were not brought up in Popish darkness and Idolatry, that you were not brought up to worship Images, pray to Saints, &c. but God alone. 3. *Pray to God for the continuance of this mercy to you & to your children after you*; that Popery might never return, but the Generations to come might be taught the Protestant Religion, that is, the good old Way to Heaven. That your *children, and children's children* might enjoy the Bible, and have the old Truths of God preached to them. For their sakes pray much. 4. *Then walk in this good old way*; if you see the Way to Happiness and not walk in it, you will fall short of it. You might be Protestants in opinion, and yet be for ever damned. A drunken Protestant, a whoring Protestant, a swearing, impenitent, unbelieving Protestant, shall not be saved, because in opinion he is a Protestant. You might refuse to commit Idolatry in bowing to, and worshipping of Images, and yet go to Hell for making an Idol of your Money, and over-loving of the World. You might renounce the Pope as Head, and in judgment own Christ, as only Head of his Church, and yet be damned for not believing on him, choosing of him before all, nor loving him above all.

Let all old corrupt things be done away; As (1) your *old Ignorance*. (2) Your *old false-loves*, (3) Your *old self-love*. (4) Your *old false peace*. (5) Your *old enmity* against God and Holiness. (6) You must be cut off from *the old stock*. In a word, for I can but name a few of many that might be said for the practical Improvement of this Text) crucifie the old man, destroy the body of Sin. For to keep your old hearts and yet think to go to Heaven is to look for a new Way of Salvation.

Let all things be new, none can walk in the old Way but who are new Creatures. (1) Your Understandings must be new; new valuations of Christ. (2) Your Wills new; new Elections of Christ. (3) Your Affections new. 1. *New Love* to God, to Christ, his Ways, his People, his Precepts. 2. *New Desires*; Oh that I had God for my Father, Christ for my Lord and Saviour, Grace as a Pledg of Glory. 3. *New Sorrows*, for walking in a way of Sin so long, neglecting Christ so long, Swearing so much, Praying so little. 4. *New Delights*. 5. *New Hatred*. (4) As Affections new, so your *Ends must be new*, Gods Glory. 5. *New Cares* to get, keep a good Conscience, to live holy, die happily and to be saved eternally.

Except you be thus made new, you might know the good old Way, but you cannot walk in it; which if you do not, *wo, wo, a thousand woes* to you for ever. A Damned Protestant! How! a Damned Protestant! that was told which was the good old and only Way, that lived under the constant, plain and powerful preaching of the same Doctrines that Christ himself and his Apostles did deliver. I profess your case will be worser, and your torments will be greater, than the Heathen who might say, *Lord we never had a Bible, never heard of Christ, nor of the way of Salvation; no Ministers were sent to us, no Gospel preached to us.* Yea, worser will be your case, and greater will be your damnation than of many amongst the Papists that have not been so *plainly taught*, so *frequently instructed*, so *faithfully warned*, so *earnestly intreated* as you have been. You are not told, that *Ignorance is the mother of Devotion*, as they be, you are not kept from reading of the Scripture, as they be, but are pressed, urged and exhorted to it. You have not publick Worship in an unknown Tongue, but by plain Language are you warned of Hell, commanded in the name of God to forsake your old wicked ways; how oft have you been perswaded to come to Christ, who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life? How long hath God waited? and will you on in your wicked ways still; in your old course of Profaneness and Lying, and Sabbath-breaking? in your old course of careless neglect of God, and Christ, and your own Immortal Souls? that's an old Way indeed, but it is not the good old Way. If you will go on, take your course, if you will not turn to the good Path, take what falls. But know that the Way of Sin leadeth directly unto Hell. Proceed a little further, go on a little longer, and thou wilt drop into a bottomless pit, and be a damned wretch and take up thy everlasting lodgings with the *old Dragon*, with the *old Serpent*; and canst thou there have rest? Rest! how canst thou under the heavy load of Gods wrath? Rest! how canst thou under the strokes of an angry, provoked and revenging God?

Thou

Thou canst not rest upon a bed of Down, when thy Conscience is feared, & God afflict thee with the *Stone* or *Plague*, or *Burning Fever*, though all thy friends be round about thee, administring Cordials & Comforts to thee. And canst thou rest in a bed of flames, in a burning fiery furnace, in a place more dreadful and more hot than is a vessel full of boiling Lead, and burning Brimstone; when thy Conscience shall be awakened, the Worm gnawing within thee, the Devils round about thee, and an angry God above thee, and not one nigh thee to pity or relieve thee? For Gods sake, Sirs, and for your Souls sake, as ever you would avoid endless, & easeless, & remedileſs torments hereafter, walk in the good old Way of Faith and Holiness, Repentance and new Obedience now.

And if you would now walk in this good old Way, you shall (1) be taken into a *New Covenant*. (2) And have *new employment*, better, more noble, more profitable, more pleasant than ever yet you were engaged in. (3) You shall be taken into *new Relations* to be the Sons of God, the Daughters of God, the Servants, People and Friends of God. (4) You shall become a new Habitation for Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. (5) You will have ground of comfort when you *come to die*. Death is the old Way into another World; and if you walk in the good old Way while you live, you may be comforted, if you can appeal to God, having the witness of a good Conscience, and say, *Now Lord remember how I have walked before thee in the good path with an upright heart*. And then (6) you shall enter into the *New Jerusalem* where you shall have (1) Universal, total Rest. (2) Seasonable Rest. (3) Eternal, and (4) Delightful Rest; And that (1) from *Sin*, from the reigning, and conflicting power of Sin, from the guilt and in-dwelling of Sin. (2) Rest from the *Temptations* of Satan, he shall never trouble nor disquiet you more. Commission of Sin is now a burden to you, and temptation to Sin is now a burden to you, but the good old Way will bring to rest from both. (3) Rest from all *Afflictions* from God upon your Bodies; now Sickness is a burden that makes you to be restless, but then you shall have an aking Head no more, pained Bowels, a sick Heart no more for ever. (4) Rest from all *Troubles* from men, no more imprisoned, persecuted; rest from all their slanders and reproaches, &c. (5) Rest from all *those holy Duties* that are now as a means to bring you to this Rest. You shall rest from Repentings and Mournings for Sin, from all the pains that now you are at to mortifie corruption; though not from loving of God, delighting in God, and admiring of his Love, nay this your Love shall be one part of your Rest. (6) Rest from all *doubts* and *fears*, and *jealousies* of heart. Now you doubt, doth God love me? do I love God? is Christ mine, and am I his? will God save me? pardon me? sometimes (thou saist) I hope he will, and that doth lighten my heart; sometimes I fear he will not, and that's a burden. Oh it is an heavy burden to my Soul, under which I cannot rest. But this good old Way will bring thee to a rest where thou shalt doubt no more, and fear no more. Canst thou doubt, whether it be day, when thou seest the Sun doth shine? or that fire is hot, when thou seest it burn, and feelest it doth warm thy hand? no more shalt thou doubt, when thou comest to the end of thy walk in the good old Way, whether God doth love thee, when thou shalt be filled with his Love, and feel that he doth love thee, and see to what a blessed place of rest, and peace, of life, of light and joy, his Love hath brought thee to. (7) Rest from all *Desertions*; God shall no more frown, no more depart, or withdraw from thee for ever. (8) Rest from all thy *worldly labours* and *employments*; when thou hast now wearied thy self in thy calling all the day, thou takest thy rest at night, and oh how sweet is rest when thou art weary; but when the day returns thy labour also doth return, and thy noble Soul by mean and low imployment (yet thy duty while thou art here) one in making *Bricks*, another *Pins*, one in working in *Wood*, another in *Silk*, or *Silver* and *Gold*, poor employment for a Rational Soul; by reason whereof God hath few of thy thoughts, little of thy delight and love; and doth distract thee often in thy holy duties; but this Way will bring thee to a Rest from all these, when God shall have all thy thoughts, delight and love. Stand then & see which is the good old Way. Nay you do see which is it; God hath shewed it unto you, it is chalked, marked out before you; Rest you are promised, and Rest you shall find in walking in it; But let none of you say in words, or heart, by your practice, we will not walk therein, lest you come unto a place of torment, where you NEVER shall have REST.

SERMON

SERMON VIII.

Mr William

No Sin Venial. Jenkin.

ROMANS 6. 23.

The Wages of Sin, is Death.

IT was a Cenſure more *true* than ſmart, which a late learned Pen, publickly in this expreſſion pronounced againſt Popery, *Romana Religio in quantum differt a noſtra, eſt mera Impoſtura*: *The* (now *Roman Religion* (*as it differs from ours*) *is a meer Cheat, Juggle, or* (kind of) *Religious Legerdemain.* And herein the Impoſture of that Religion eminently appears, in that under the Varniſh of *Chriſtian*, moſt of it ſeems calculated only for hooking in of *worldly gain*, and promoting of ſecular advantage. What Bp. *Senhouſe* (the *Cambridg-Chryſoſtom* of his time) ſaith in his Sermon upon *Acts* 19. 28, concerning *Demetrius* and his Fellow Crafts-men, their crying of, *Great is the Diana of the Epheſians*; *the Shrines of Diana cauſing their Shrieks for Diana, and their great Gain by her, raiſing up their great Cry for her, ſhewed there was* dolus in Idolo, *deceit in their Contention for the Idol*; may as truly be ſaid of the *Romiſh Demetrius*, the Pope and the Popiſh Prieſts, their eager out-cry in the Defence of the Points of Popery, it being not *Chriſt* but *Mammon*, not *Piety* but *Money*, not *God* but *Gold*, that ingageth them in their advancing of their Doctrines and Devotions. As Saint *Ambroſe* ſpake of *Benjamins* Sack, *Sacco ſoluto apparuit argentum*, when *the Sack was looſed, the Silver appeared*; reſolve the moſt of their Theology into that whereof 'tis Conſtituted, and Silver (Gain I mean) will be found to be the chief Element of its Conſtitution. Of this their own Writers are fitteſt Witneſſes, whom I have cited in their own words; for proving of this my Accuſation. *Æneas Silvius* (afterwards Pope) informs us, That *the Roman Court gives nothing without Silver*; *It ſells* (ſaith he) *the Impoſition of Hands, the Gifts of the Holy Ghoſt*; *nor is Pardon of Sin given*

Doctor *Prideaux* Lect.

Gen. 44. 11, 12.

Nihil eſt quod abſq; argento Romana Curia dedat; Ipſa manuum impoſitio & Spiritus Sancti dona venduntur, nec peccatorum venia niſi nummatis impenditur. *Æneas Silvius* Ep. 56.

Venalia nobis Templa, Sacerdotes, Altaria, Sacra, Coronæ, ignis, thura, preces, Cœlum est venale, Deusq; *Mantu.* l. 3.

Si quid Roma dabit, nugas dabit, accipit aurum, verba dat; heu Romæ nunc sola pecunia regnat. *B. Mantuan.* Eclog. 5. & 9.

In proverbium jamdudum abiit Romana permutio, plumbi videlicet cum auro. *Duaren. de Sac. Ec. Min.* l. 1. c. 6.

Regina rerum pecunia, divitibus licitum facit quod in pauperibus est illicitum. *Claud. Espens. Digr.* 2. *ad cap.* 1. *Ep. ad Tit.*

Si spes refulserit nummi, quod interdictum fuit prius, jam liberè fit & impune.

Quod vetatur, numerata pecunia Dispensatur, quasi nullum sit peccatum majus, quam

given to any but such as are well-Monied. A Poet of their own faith, That *with them, Temples, Priests, Altars, Prayers, yea Heaven, and* God *himself, are all set to Sale for Money*; and that *Rome gives Trifles and takes Gold.* Another relates, That *Romana permutatio auri cum plumbo*, The *Roman change, of Lead for Gold, was grown into a Proverb. Only Money reigns at Rome* (thus speaks another) *and makes that lawful for the Rich which is unlawful for the Poor*; and (as he goes on) *lay down but Money, and then that which was forbidden before as an heinous wickedness, shall now be dispensed with, and made no sin*; *but without Money, there is no Dispensation:* and (as my Author *Claudius Espenseus* mournfully proceeds) *the vice they esteem greatest, is to want Money*; *and to have nothing, is the greatest piece of Barbarity among them*; and (as that plain-dealing Papist adds) *to heighten their abomination, they allow their very Clergy-men to dwell with Whores and Harlots, and to beget Bastards for a certain Tax, which they do not only receive of the Adulterous, but even of the Continent and Innocent persons*; *alledging for this, that even these might have taken Whores also if they had pleased.* I blush to translate what he adds, namely, That *Bastards, Thieves, Adulterers, perjured Persons, are not only absolved for Money, but admitted to all Dignities and Spiritual Benefices*; *and for Money, Dispensations are granted for Murders, though of Presbyters, Fathers, Mothers, Brothers, Sisters, yea of Wives, nay, for Witchcraft, Incest with the nearest of kin*; *and* (which is most amazing) *for uncleanness*, Contra naturam cum Brutis, *for the* (not-to-be-named) *Sin of Bestiality.* And *Rivet* tells us in his Castigation of *Petra-Sancta the Jesuit*, That *there came to his hands a Book, written by one* Toffanus Denys, *printed* 1500. *at* Paris, *Cum Privilegio*, where in *fol.* 38, are taxed at a *certain Rate, all Absolutions in the Court of* Rome *for murdering of Brethren and Sisters, Fathers, Mothers, Wives, and for the carnal knowledg of a Mans Sister or Mother, pro eo qui Sororem, Matrem carnaliter cognovit*, in his 37 page of his *Jesuita vapulans.* *Chemnitius* in his *Examen* concerning the Point of *Indulgences*, gives us a Copy of Verses written over the Altar in a Popish Cathedral, of which Verses when I read them in *Chemnitius*, I could hardly say whether they more proved my foregoing *Accusation* of, or provoked my just *indignation* against *Popery*, that *Master-piece of painted Atheism.* All the Verses of that pitiful piece of Poetry, are too many to set down, some of them are these:

Ut tibi sit pœnæ venia sit aperta crumena,
Hic datur exponi Paradisus venditioni,
Hic si large des, in Cœlo sit tua sedes,
Pro solo nummo gaudebis in æthere summo.

nummis carere, ut Ille apud *Horatium Ec.* 2. Credidit ingens pauperiem vitium; & ut alter, *l.* 3. nunc est Barbaries grandis habere nihil. Taxa non excipit Presbytericidas, paricidas, matricidas, incestos, deniq; *Contra naturam cum Brutis*, &c. *Espen.* in *Tit. p.* mihi 478, 479. Si nihil numeraveris, indispensatus manes. Id.—Clericos cum pellicibus cohabitare, liberosq; procreare sinunt, accepto ab eis quotannis certo censu, atque adeo alicubi a continentibus; habeant, aiunt si velint.

The

The ſum whereof, and the reſt, is but this, *Lay down your Money, and doubt not of getting up to Glory.* The *Romiſh Jeroboam*, I mean the *Pope*, ſets up the two *Calves* of his golden *Faith* and *Worſhip* to preſerve to himſelf his carnal Kingdom; of which Faith and Worſhip, the greateſt part is purely ſubſervient to the *Popes*, either *Coffer* or *Kitchin*, and of which *Kingdom*, more truly than of *War*, Money may be ſaid to be the *Soul* and *Sinews*. If their Doctrines may be witneſſes to prove ſo clear an accuſation, I might produce a far greater number than is needful to make up an *ordinary Jury*, by mentioning thoſe of *Auricular Confeſſion*, *Pilgrimages*, *Penance*, *Images*, *Prayers for the Dead*, *Indulgences*, *Purgatory*, *Sacrifice of the Maſs*, *Merits*, *Holineſs of places*, *breaking faith with Hereticks*, *the Popes Superiority over Princes*, *diſpenſation with Oaths*; *and this before us*, *of Venial Sin.* All theſe arrows, if they were not *level'd* at the *mark of Gain*, yet ſure I am, they moſt exactly *hit* and *center* in it (ſtrange they ſhould meet ſo *unitedly* if ſhot at *rovers*); if you conſult the generality of their Doctrines, moſt of the Queſtions in the *Popiſh* Catechiſm, may eaſily be reduced to this *one*, *What ſhall we get for our Paunches and Purſes?* A Catechiſm not compos'd by *Peter* the Popes pretended Predeceſſor (who though he ſaid, *Silver and Gold have I none*; yet alſo ſaid, *thy Money periſh with thee*); but by *Judas* his *bag-bearing pattern*, in that queſtion of his for betraying of Chriſt,---- *Quid dabitis? What will you give me?* 'Twas ingenuouſly ſpoken by a late Poet, when he thus verſify'd;

An Petrus Romæ fuerit, ſub judice lis eſt
Simonem Romæ nemo fuiſſe negat.
We are not ſure that Peter *ever ſat*
In Rome, *but* Simon *did, we're ſure of that.*

Simon, that *Simon* who barter'd and chaffer'd for the Spirit with Money, is *conſtant Reſident* at *Rome*, where ſome hundreds of years, in many thouſands of Bargains, he hath been as *ſucceſsful* in *ſelling to fools*, as ever was his Predeceſſor *inſucceſsful* in his attempt to buy of the Apoſtles. Among all their Doctrines of this *earthen* and *muddy* complexion, we ſhall this day, more particularly produce this of *Venial Sin*, principally both *ſet up*, and *ſhor'd up*, that the pretended puniſhment of thoſe in Purgatory, may be bought off by money; and that without any *beholdingneſs* to the *blood of Chriſt*, provided the Purſe will but bleed *freely*, as drawn by *Romiſh Prieſts*, the common *Purſe-leeches*, or religious *Cut-purſes* of the Chriſtian World; and from hence it was, that Sins, by Papiſts call'd pardonable, have been rather termed *ſaleable*, *venalia* not *venialia*, with a very ſmall and *venial* alteration of the word *venial.*

Nos docemus communi conſenſu, peccata quædam, ex naturâ ſuâ, hominem non reddere mortis æternæ reum, ſed tantum ſupplicii temporalis. *Bellar. c. 1. de Pec. Ven.*

Nos unanimi conſenſu negamus illud quod *Bellarmino* affirmat communi conſenſu doceri. *Ames, Bellar. Enerv. l. 2. c. 1.*

I wonder not therefore that *Bellarmine* in his firſt Chapter of *Venial Sin*, thus ſets out, *We teach* (ſaith *Bellarmine*) *by common conſent, That there are ſome Sins which of their own nature, do not render a man guilty of eternal death, but only of temporal puniſhment.* To which Expreſſion of his, Orthodox *Ames* thus replys, *Nos unanimi conſenſu negamus illud quod* Bellarminus

minus *affirmat, communi consensu doceri. We* (Protestants) *deny with an unanimous consent, that which* Bellarmine *affirms is taught (among them) with common consent.* My Work this day, is to declare my Concurrence with our Protestant Divines, in their denial and detesting the blasphemous Doctrine of *Venial Sin.* Only I cannot but mention as an encouraging entrance into this approaching Employment, the *wariness* of *Bellarmines* Expression, in these words, *Communi consensu docemus*; we teach by *common consent*; for he could not say (as Dr. *Ames* his Answerer) we teach our Doctrine herein with *unanimous consent.* For (as *Medina* an eminent Papist confesseth) *the Popish Doctors are infinitely at odds, and disagree among themselves in finding out, how a Venial and a Mortal Sin differ.* 'Tis true the black Regiment, or rather the *forlorn Adventurers* of the Antichristian Army, strike home, and speak out for their General the Pope, and his Cause in this Point. *Bellarmine* tells us, That some Sins are so far from deserving eternal punishment, that *God cannot punish them eternally without injustice. Gregory de Valentia* saith, *That Venial Sin may be remitted without any infusion of Grace. Sonnius* (the Papist I mean), That *they deserve pardon. Alphonsus a Castro*, That *Peccatum veniale non valet privare gratia*; *Sin Venial cannot deprive of grace.* And that wretched *Andradius* (the worst of the Crew), with his more devout brother *Bonaventure* asserts, That for *Venial Sins we do not so much as need Repentance.* The Provincial Council of *Mentz* dictate, *That many depart this life, free from Mortal Sins, and for lighter Sins they shall never be damned*; *and that it can hardly be understood how God should be just, should he punish any for Venial Sins with eternal punishment.* And that *Concilium Senonense* declares, *That he who dies involv'd in Venial Sins* (among which it particularly mentions *idle words*, of which Christ saith, *We must give an account, and by which we shall be condemned*, Mat. 12. 37.) *though he be unfit for Heaven, yet neither is it fit he should go to Hell, as being a partaker of Grace, but is to be purged by the fire of Purgatory, out of which he is to be delivered by the prayers of the living*; *and that whosoever thinks otherwise, is guilty of the* Lutheran, Wiclevian *and* Waldensian *Heretical pravity.*

As for that Council (if we may so call the *Conventicle*) of *Trent*, it requires that *all Bishops should take care, that Prayers and the Sacrifices of the Mass, should be devoutly offered for the dead, and accurately performed to free them from the punishment of Venial Sin.* The same *Trent*-Assembly

Quâ ratione distinguatur peccatum veniale à mortali, non una est sententia Doctorum, sed variant in infinitum Doctores. *Medin. in* 1, 2. *q.* 88. *a.* 1.

Cum multi ex hac vitâ migrent, à lethalibus quidem crimininibus immunes; levioribus tamen alius alio magis implicatus, quorum tamen nemo, sive ob plura, sive pauciora hæc delicta quotidiana, damnationem æternam sustinebit: non facilè modus inveniri posset, quomodo Deus (qui est

in omnibus & erga omnes justissimus) non injustus videretur, si non post hanc vitam, per temporales & non æternas pœnas, omnium compensatio expectaretur. *Bin. Tom.* 9. *c.* 46. *p. mihi* 322. Cum peccati tantum venialis reus, repente nonnunquam intereat, de omni verbo etiam otioso rationem redditurus, nec illi pateat aditus ad Cœlestem Hierusalem, in quam nihil intrat coinquinatum; nec item Gehennæ subjaceat, quippe qui gratiæ sit particeps, ac pœnæ tantum temporalis debitor; fit ut primum purgetur ex iis quæ gessit in corpore, salvus tandem aliquando futurus, sic tamen quasi per ignem. *Bin. Tom.* 9. *p. mihi* 198. Curent Episcopi ut fidelium vivorum suffragia, missarum scilicet sacrificia, orationes, eleemosynæ, aliaque pietatis opera quæ pro fidelibus defunctis fieri consueverunt, piè & devote fiant. *Bin. Tom.* 9. *Sess.* 25. *Conc. Trid. p. mihi* 419 & *Sess.* 14. *c.* 7. *p. mihi* 389.

clearly

clearly discovers that they hold, that 'tis not necessary to confess Venial Sins. 'Tis true therefore (as I said), that those bored slaves of the Pope, thus *tearingly* express themselves in the asserting of *Venial Sin*. But yet 'twas honestly said by *Bellarmine* however, That this Doctrine of the *Veniality of Sin*, is taught (in the Antichristian Synagogue) only with a *common* (not an *unanimous*) *consent*. For the learnedst of the Papists, as *Vega*, *Altissiodorensis*, *Almain*, *Azorius*, *Durand*, *Fisher* of *Rochester*, (who lost his Head for his maintaining the Popes Headship) but especially *Gerson* Chancellor of *Paris*, liberally assert that all *Sin is mortiferous or deadly*; and that none is Venial, or deserving of Pardon: To all which I add that for the first seven hundred years after Christ, the Doctrine of *Venial Sin* was *never* taught by any *Father*, or *Doctor*, or maintain'd in any *Council*. Nor can *Bellarmine*, after his strictest search into the Fathers; nor could he, nor dares he name *one* of them that ever us'd the very name or word of *Venial Sin*. This being premised as an encouragement to our conflict, namely that the best Soldiers of the Enemies Army, are come over to our side (a sign of their ensuing overthrow,) you may take up the truth of this Doctrine concerning *Venial Sin*, either in an affirmative or negative Proposition (which you please): If in an *Affirmative*, receive it thus; *Every Sin is of its own nature mortiferous and deadly, deserving eternal punishment.* If in a *Negative*, take it thus; *No Sin deserves pardon*; or thus, *No Sin is exempted from deserving eternal death*; or (as 'tis usually expressed), *No Sin is Venial in its own nature.* In the discussing this great Truth, I shall (God willing) discourse, The main Point.

By way of { 1. Explication. 2. Confirmation. 3. Application.

I. In the Explication I shall proceed by way of

1. *Concession*, or granting what is not to be deny'd.
2. By way of *Negation*, or denial of what is not to be granted; that by both, the question may be *clear'd*, by being freed from the *fogs* of *Popish* Objections.

I. For the first way of *Explication*, *viz.* of *Concession*, I grant,

1. *All private offences of man against man, have a pardon from man due to them*; and that 'tis so, the Scriptures fully discover, *Ephes.* 4. 32. *Col.* 3. 13. *Rom.* 12. *&c.* in requiring *mutual forgiveness*. 'Tis well expressed by *Chamier*, *There's no sin of any against us, but is Venial.* But how weak is *Bellarmines* argument from hence, to prove that *Venial Sins* do not hinder God from loving us. *If all offences* (saith he) *dissolve the love of God, by the same reason should they dissolve love and friendship between man and man; but this they do not, therefore, &c.*

Nullum est peccatum cujusquam in nos, non veniale. *Chamier Panstr. de pec. ven. p. mihi* 182: Eâdem ratione concludere posset *Bellarminus* Deum teneri peccata hominibus remittere quia homines inimicos suos diligere debent, & injurias ipsis quoad vindictam condonare. *Innes, Bellar. Enerv. de Ven. pec. p.* 11.

I an-

Non est æquum, hominum in homines officia æquari officiis hominum in Deum, itaque neque peccata. Ac proinde nullum est peccatum cujusquam in nos, non veniale, at hominum in Deum nullum veniale; multa certe mortalia ipsis fatentibus Papistis. *Cham. Panstr. de pec. Ven. Id. ibid.*

I answer; The consequence is not only false, but *blasphemous*, for the favour of God, and the reasons for which that is preserved or dissolved, are not to be paralleld with the friendship of man, and the reasons for which this is either maintain'd or destroy'd. Nor are the Offices of man to man to be equaliz'd with the Duties of man to God, and so neither the offences. To make this plain, I argue,

1. From Popish Principles.
2. From undeniable Reason.

1. From Popish Principles. For,

1. Do they not constantly declare, That though a man, be he never so high, he neither doth nor should inflict great punishments upon his inferiors for light and small offences, yet that God inflicts grievous torments upon his Children for the least, even *Venial Sins*, even the torments of *Purgatory*, not less than those of Hell, but only in *duration*, (if you'l believe *Bellarmine*;) the least whereof (as *Aquinas* tells us,) is greater than the greatest in this life?

2. Do not the *Papists* grant that there are *many* kinds of offences which *do not* destroy Humane friendship (nor ought) which yet exclude *from Gods love?* As when a man out of a *good intention* of helping or benefiting his friend, proves *hurtful* or *offensive* to him; this excludes not a man from his friends favour; but when a man out of a zealous intention to please God, doth offend him (as *Paul* did who thought *he did God good service* in persecuting the Church), he doth with *Paul* in that case, sin *mortally*, and deserve exclusion from the favour of God.

2. I argue from undeniable reason: The sum whereof is this; *Man* offended by *man* hath causes to continue still his love to *man*, which *God* offended hath *not*.

1. Man by the bond of a *Precept*, is bound to forgive man; but God is not *capable* of such a *bond*.

2. Man offended, is a *finite* creature, and therefore offences against him, are comparatively *small* and *inconsiderable*; but offences against God are against an *infinite* Majesty, and therefore *infinite*.

3. Offences against Man are *mutual*, the *offended to day*, may be the *offendor to morrow*; but *God* never can *wrong* his Creature, no, though *he hurts it*; *What iniquity have your fathers found in me?* Jer. 2. 11.

4. Man offended may be, and perhaps hath been *benefited* by *the Man offending*; but to *God no good of ours can extend*.

5. A man offended, oft *warns not* the offendor that he should not offend or wrong him, but God hath *a thousand times admonisht, exhorted, intreated, threatned against offending of him*.

Second Concession.

2. I grant, though all Sins deserve eternal punishment, and though no Sins are Venial, yet that *all Sins are not equal, nor do they deserve equal punishment*. The Papists would willingly fasten this *Stoical dotage* upon us, of holding *the equality of Sin* (as did the *Jovinianists* of old) in requital for our maintaining the *damnableness of all Sin*; but what they

they say herein of us, is a meer slandering of us. This Calumny *Duræus* in his Eighth Book against our famous *Whitaker* (*Quantum nomen!*) hath cast upon learned *Calvin*, That *he held all Sins were equal*, because *he held all were mortal*. The like also saith *Gautierus* in his Chronological Table of the fourth Age, where speaking of the *Jovinianists* their making all Sins equal, he impudently tells us, *Calvins Doctrine is conformable to those who held all Sins equal, because it makes them all mortal*. But blessed *Calvin* both purgeth *himself* from the Calumny, and confutes the *argument* on which 'tis grounded, in the third Book of his *Institutions*, *cap.* 4, by this *invincible answer*; *Scio* (saith he) *quam inique Doctrinam nostram calumnientur*, &c. *I know how unjustly the Papists calumniate our Doctrine*; *they say*, *By our making all Sins mortal and damnable, we set up the Paradox of the Stoicks, of the equality of Sins*; *but* (saith he) *the very Doctrine of the Papists themselves will fully clear us*; *for I demand of them, Do they not acknowledg that among those Sins they call Mortal, there is an inequality, and that one Mortal Sin is greater than another, and therefore they cannot charge me with making all Sins equal, because I hold they are all Mortal*. How is then the Doctrine of *Equality* of Sins, more to be fathered upon *Calvin*, than upon the Papists themselves? 'Tis our constant Doctrine, That Sins and their punishments are *unequal*, though all Sins are *Mortal*. We teach, Though all Sins *deserve eternal punishment*, yet not the *same degree* of eternal punishment, but some a *lesser* degree than others. Though *all Sins* deserve a punishment *extensively infinite*, yet not *intensively equal*. We agree to that old expression of *a mitius ardent nonnulli*; the flames of Hell shall be less torturing to some, than to others; for some, it will be *more tolerable at the day of judgment than for others*; *some are beaten with more, others with fewer stripes*, Luk. 12. 47, 48. As among the *Jews* there were several degrees of capital punishment for several offences, so are there in Hell several degrees of punishment suted to the degrees of Sin. Of which truth the words of Christ, *Mat.* 5. 22, are a clear proof, which tell us of the punishment inflicted by the *Judgment*, which was the *Consessus singularum Civitatum*, the Assembly belonging to every City, consisting of three and twenty, by whom the punishment inflicted was (according to the best Writers) *killing with the Sword*. In the same Scripture next we read of the punishment inflicted by the *Council* or *Sanedrim* consisting of seventy Elders, for greater offences, which punishment was *Stoning*. And lastly, there is mentioned the punishment of Γέεννα πυρὸς, call'd *Hell-fire*, which was by the old Idolaters exercised upon their *Infants*, who were sacrificed in the Valley of *Hinnom*: Christ by the similitude of these Earthly punishments which passed one another in sharpness & severity, setting forth the

In eo *Calvinus* peccata paria facit quòd omnia mortalia, & æternis digna suppliciis censuerit. *Duræ. cont. whitak. Lib.* 8. Non parum conformis est Doctrina *Calvini*, nolentis audire peccata venialia, sed omnia definiens mortalia. *Gaut. Tab. Chron. sec.* 4*ti*. Scio quàm iniquè Doctrinam hanc nostram Calumnientur. Dicunt enim paradoxum esse Stoicorum de peccatorum æqualitate. Sed suo ipsorum ore, nullo negotio convincentur. —— Quæro enim, annon inter ea ipsa peccata, quæ mortalia fatentur, aliud alio majus agnoscant? Non igitur protinus sequitur paria esse peccata, quæ simul mortalia sunt. *Calv. Instit. l.* 3. *c.* 4. *sec.* 13.

consessus 23, virûm singularum civitatum; summus autem ille Synedrion vocatur. Κρίσεως est usitatissima erat gladius. Cum autem supra lapidationem, nulla pœna in usu Judaico esset, quæsivit Christus aliunde nomen horrendi cruciatus, qui & gladium & lapidationem excederet, *scil.* Κρίσεως pœnæ *Gehennæ* ignis. *Grot. in loc.*

degrees

degrees of punishments, in the place of the damned. This will yet be clearer, if we duly consider the case to which Christ is speaking, concerning which we may thus understand Christ expressing himself: *Heretofore men have been deter'd from murdering others, because the Law commands that murtherers should be cut off by the sword; But I would have you take heed of anger, because that is to be punisht in the next world as severely as murder is punisht in this. But if any to his anger, shall add evil-speaking he shall be punisht with a greater punishment; as Stoning is a greater than that by the Sword. And if his evil-speaking be very grievous and hainous, he shall suffer more exquisite torments, such as those sustained who were burnt in the Valley of* Hinnom. See *Grotius* on the place. And hereby *Bellarmines* Cavil is answered, who to prove that *all Sins* are not Mortal, and deserving eternal punishment in Hell, argues thus; *Here are* (saith he) *two Temporal punishments less than that of Hell-fire; and because he is only guilty of Hell-fire who breaks out into such an* outragious anger *as to call his brother* fool, *therefore the other degrees of anger are* Venial Sins, *as being only threatned with* Temporal *punishments.* But this *erroneous Sophister* perverts the true sense of this Text, not considering that the true import thereof is this, That all the *three degrees* of anger here mentioned by our Saviour, are *totidem homicidia*, so many murders (as *Pareus* speaks) and that the three *degrees* of punishment expressed here, are three degrees *unius specie pœnæ*, of one punishment in *kind and nature*, which is eternal punishment *in Hell*, and that a *less degree* of torment in Hell is understood by the *Judgment*, than by the word *Council*, and a less by *Council* than by *Hell-fire*, and that all the three degrees of punishment here expressed by Christ, *equally intend the punishment of the damned in Hell*, though not in equality of punishment to be inflicted on the offenders. Thus *Irenæus* of old interpreted this Text: *Not only* (saith he) *is he guilty of killing to damnation, who kills his brother, but even he who is angry with him without a cause.* So Saint *Austin de verb. Domini*; *Omnes cruciabuntur, sed minus ille, minus ille*; All shall be tormented, though some more, some less. Thus also *Barradius* and *Maldonat*, *Bellarmines* fellow-Jesuits, (though not greater *Sophisters*, yet better Expositors than *Bellarmine*) interpret this Text, ingenuously confessing, That by *Judgment* and *Council* as well as by *Hell-fire*, the *eternal death* of the Soul is to be understood, though with a gradual difference of the punishment.

Vid. *Grot.* in loc.

Tres iracundiæ species totidem facit homicidii species, & per hoc lethales omnes coram Deo, licet impariter. *Dav. Pareus contr. Bellar. de amiss. Grat. p.* 90, 91.

Non solum qui occidit, reus est occisionis ad damnationem, sed qui irascitur fine causâ fratri suo. *Iren. l.* 2. *c.* 46.

Tres hi gradus supplicii pœnam significant Gehennalem. *Barrad. l.* 7. *c.* 17.

Per Concilium, capitalem pœnam intelligit, per civilem capitis pœnam, sempiternam animæ mortem intelligit. Christus & eum qui irascitur, & eum qui fratrem suum levem, & eum qui stultum appellat eadem inferni pœna, non eadum pœnæ gravitate dignum docet. *Maldon. in Mat.* 5. 22.

3. My third Concession is this. *Though no Sin be venial but every Sin deserves eternal death, yet no Sin of its own nature necessarily and infallibly damns, but the Sin against the Holy Ghost.* All other Sins may possibly be pardoned, *Mat.* 12. 31. every Sin that admits of Repentance, is pardonable. All Sins are *remissible seclusâ finalis impœnitentiæ respectu*, which are not followed with final impenitence, as is that against the *Holy Ghost*. Other Sins make a man *liable to death*, this *pertinaciously opposite to the terms of life.* This is *that Sin unto death* mentioned 1 *Joh.* 5. 16 17.

And

And hereby the argument of *Baly* the Jesuite for Venial Sin is obviated, who from this Scripture, which mentions a *Sin not unto death, and a Sin that is unto death*; argues, that some Sins are of their *own nature venial*, and *not* deserving death, though other Sins are *mortal*, and *do* deserve death. 'Tis true St. *John* distinguisheth between a *Sin not unto death*, and a *Sin unto death*; but by both expressions he intends Sins *mortiferous in their own nature*, and such as *deserve* eternal death. By the *Sin not unto death*, he understands a Sin notwithstanding which, a man *may* avoid *eternal death*, and may be pardoned though it *deserves eternal death*; and by a *Sin unto death* he intends a Sin which whosoever commits, can *never be pardoned*, and therefore can *never* escape *eternal death*; and hence he would not have *such* a Sinner as commits it, *pray'd for*. And that by the *Sin not unto death* he doth not mean a *venial* Sin that *deserves not death*, is plain from this very Text, where the Apostle saith, *That life shall be given for them that have not sin'd unto death*, by the prayers of the faithful; but I desire to know why *life should be given for him that sins not unto death*, if his Sins were *venial* & did not at all *deserve death*. Certainly the sin which the Apostle calls a *sin not unto death*, had meritoriously taken away the *life of the Soul*, and so cannot be accounted *venial*, but in some kind mortal; and 'tis as plain from the Text, that by *the Sin* which is *unto death*, the Apostle means not a Sin which is *mortal*, or only deserving death, as distinguisht from Venial Sin; because the Apostle forbids the *praying for him that commits that sin which is unto death*. Now if the Apostle forbids praying for him whose Sin is mortal, as only deserving death, then it would unavoidably follow that none should be *pray'd for* that commit *mortal Sins* or Sins deserving death, but only they who commit *Venial Sins*; which is contrary to Christs, both Precept and Example, who both commands us to pray for Persecuters, (and no Papist can deny that *Persecution* is a *Mortal Sin.*) and did himself, as also did after him that Blessed Martyr *Stephen* pray for his Persecuters. And so clearly true is this, that *Bartholomæus Petrus* a Papist, and Professor of *Doway*, in his Continuation of *Estius*'s Comment on the Epistles, on 1 *Joh.* 5. 16. ingenuously confesseth, That by a Sin *not unto death* is to be understood, a Sin from which a man may *arise by repentance*, and that by a *Sin unto death*, we are to understand a *Sin from which a man can never arise by repentance*. And that a Mortal Sin may be said to be *not unto death*, he illustrates by the speech of *Christ* concerning *Lazarus*'s Sickness. *This Sickness* (saith Christ) *is not unto death*; namely, because *Lazarus* was to be recall'd to life, and so a *Sin not unto death*, is a Sin from which, and from death by which, a man may be recall'd; as a Sin *unto* death is a Sin from which, and from death by which, a man cannot

Peccatum non ad mortem dicitur Apostolo, quod est mortale quidem sed agitur ejus pœnitentia. Videbitur hoc mirum alicui, quod peccatum quoddam mortale dicatur non ad mortem esse; sed meminisse debet quod salvator *Joan.* 11. dicebat, infirmitas hæc non est ad mortem, cum tamen *Lazarus* ex eâ infirmitate mortuus fuerit; sic in proposito peccatum mortale, cujus vera pœnitentia agitur, non est ad mortem. *Barth. Pet.* in 1 *Joh.* 5. 16.

Comparatio hæc inter peccata, aptius fit, intelligendo de peccato, non veniali, sed mortali. *Lorin.* in *loc.* Peccatum non ad mortem; non potest peccatum significare veniale, cum enim dicat *Johannes*, Oranti pro peccato non ad mortem dandam esse vitam, plane indicat hoc peccatum non ad mortem, spiritualem vitam adimere, quod si spirituali vitâ destituitur qui peccat non ad mortem, mortifero scelere obstringatur, necesse est. *Justin.* in *loc.*

be recall'd. Thus also *Lorinus* and *Justinian* both Jesuits expound this place of *John*; expresly and fully.

The fourth Concession.

4. My fourth Concession is this; *Though no Sin be Venial in its own nature, and deserving of pardon; yet this hinders not but that Sin is Venial by an extrinsick cause, namely, the grace and mercy of God in Christ.* Though *Venial* Sins (as the Papists call them) in themselves are *Mortal*; yet *Mortal Sins through Grace are Venial.* All the Sins of the *Elect*, and of those in the *state* of *Grace*, are, though in themselves *damnable*, yet pardoned *through Grace*, and not *damning. There is no condemnation to them* (saith the Apostle) *that are in Christ Jesus.* Though the *least Sin* makes us *guilty* of damnation if God should deal with us *strictly*, and *secundum legis rigorem*, according to the rigour of the Law; yet the *greatest* cannot effect this *guiltiness* of damnation, where mercy through *Christ* is conferr'd upon the most unworthy. Sins in *themselves* unworthy of pardon, are *Venial* to the *guilty*, *ex benignitate judicis*, by the goodness of the Judg, and remissible to the *debtor*, *ex liberalitate Creditoris*, by the bounty of the Creditor. Though *ex peccati natura*, every Sin excludes from Salvation; yet *ex misericordia Dei*, no Sin doth so. Though Sin be not exempted from desert of punishment, *quia vindicari non debet*; yet 'tis exempted, *quia Deus vindicare nolit.* Though not because it *ought* not to be punished; yet because God through Christ *will not* punish it.

Rom. 8. 1.

Venialia dicuntur peccata, ab Eventu, non quòd per se veniâ digna sunt. Sunt venialia reis ex benignitate judicis, remissibilia debitori ex creditoris liberalitate. *Rivet. Tr.* 4. *Q.* 13.

And hence, 1. It follows, that as all the Sins of Reprobates are deadly, not only *ex merito*, because of their *merit*; but also *ex eventu*, and in the *event*, because no Sin is *Venial* in it *self*, but only by Gods *mercy*: So likewise, 2. That the reason why the Sins of the *Regenerate* exclude them not from the favour of God, is not from their *own nature*, but meerly from Gods *mercy*, all Sins deserving that exclusion. Yea, 3. Hence it follows, that though *damnation* be actually inflicted upon *some* for their Sins, *viz. Unbelievers*; yet *remission* and *salvation* may be bestow'd upon *others*, notwithstanding they have committed those *very* Sins for which *others* are damned. To Unbelievers *Whoredom* is damning, and excludes them from *the Kingdom of God*, Ephes. 5. 5; and yet *Davids* Adultery excluded not him from that Kingdom. The murdering of *Christ* was imputed to *Judas* and *Pilate*; and yet not to those *Act.* 2. 23, 38. who *slew Christ with wicked hands*, whom *Peter* wills to *repent*, and be *baptized*, *for the remission of sins.* God pardoned *Davids* Adultery with *Bathsheba*, but might not *Antonies* with *Cleopatra*; *Lots* Incest was,

was, *Herods* might not be forgiven. *Solomons* Idolatry was, and *Jeroboams* might not be remitted. Yea hence I fear not to assert, that *greater* Sins may be *pardon'd* to *some*, when *smaller* may *damn others:* An *idle word* may destroy *one*, when *Murder* and *Adultery* may not *another*.

And this fully answers *Bellarmines* Argument for the *Veniality* of Sin. 'Tis this, *If all Sins be Mortal of their own nature, and only Venial to Believers, because of their Faith; then all Sins should be Mortal to Unbelievers, and Venial to Believers:* But *this* (saith he) *is false, that all Sins of Unbelievers should be Mortal, and all Sins of Believers Venial; for if they be Venial to Believers, then much more are they so to Unbelievers.* But why so, O Cardinal? Because (saith he) the Sins of *Believers* are *more* grievous and *hainous* than the Sins of *Unbelievers*, as being committed against *more light and love*. Now this Argument is easily answer'd by my fourth Concession. 'Tis *not* false that Sins though *smaller in genere peccati*, in the *kind* of Sin, should be *Mortal* to *Unbelievers*, and greater Sins *Venial* to *Believers*; for as they are *Mortal* to *both* of their *own nature*, so by *accident*, through the mercy of God, pardoning to Believers both their smaller and greater Sins, their Sins become *Venial* in the *event*; which *accident* being deficient to Unbelievers in their sinning, *Nequaquam eorum peccata facit venialia, sed ut sunt finit mortalia*; It makes not their Sins *Venial, but leaves them as they are in themselves Mortal*, as learned *Pareus* in answer to *Bellarmine*. We grant (as *Gerard* expresseth it), that the *pardoned Sins* of *Believers* are *more* hainous than those of *Unbelievers*; but hence it cannot be infer'd, that some Sins of *Unbelievers* are *Venial*: For that the Sins of *Believers* are *Venial*, 'tis not from the nature of their *Sins*, but from the meer *Grace* of God pardoning, and not imputing their Sins; and therefore to all *Unbelievers* their Sins remain such as they are of their own nature, that is, *Mortal* or *Mortiferous*. This also stops the mouth of that desperate or despairing Papist *Cotton*, who thus argues, to hold that all Sins deserve *eternal punishment*, and that none can live without Sin, *is the ready way to drive men to the precipice of despair*, especially when dying (he should have said; 'Tis the ready way to drive the Priests, those silly Quacks, into despair of purging the Purse with the pill of Purgatory): But the answer is easie, This Argument only becomes those *quibus Dei misericordia est ignota*, (as *Chamier* speaks), who are strangers to

Fideles gravius peccantes, venialiter peccant; ergo multo magis venialiter peccant infideles, levius peccantes; sic *Bellarminus*. Respondet *Pareus*. Antecedens falsum est intellectum per se, verum est ex accidenti, propter misericordiam Dei veniâ delentis non levia tantum, sed omnia peccata fidelium respiscentium; quod accidens cum in peccatis infidelium deficiat, nequaquam ea venalia facit, sed mortalia finit, ut sunt suâ naturâ omnia eorum peccata. *Pareus contr. Bell. de amiss. Grat. c.* 11. Certum est renatos per peccata mortalia contra conscientiam commissa, gravius Deum offendere quam infideles, quibus tantum cognitionis lumen, ac tantus beneficiorum divinorum cumulus non obtigit; sed ex eo nondum inferri potest, quædam peccata infidelium esse suâ natura venialia; quòd enim in renatis quædam sint venialia, id non est à naturâ peccatorum, sed ex solâ Dei miserentis, & peccata non imputantis gratiâ. Ergo in non-renatis & infidelibus, omnia omnino peccata sunt & manent talia, qualia sunt ex naturâ suâ, hoc est, mortalia. *Gerh. loc. Com. de pec. act. p.* 306.

the mercy of God in Christ, and will not trust to it for Salvation. 'Tis not the *smalness* of Sin, but the *greatness* of Christ, that saves us. This pitiful Papist draws a damnable *conclusion* from a *Divine* principle. The *principle* is, *No sin is Venial*; therefore (saith he) *despair*; but therefore say we, believe, go out to *Christ* for free remission through his blood, whereby all Sin *Mortal* in its nature, is *Venial* to the Believer. And let me tell thee (O thou blind Papist) though thou sinnest *much* in making Sin *small*, yet thou sinnest *more* in making my *Saviour* so. I shall conclude this fourth *Concession*, with manifesting the consent herein of the learnedest of the *Papists* with our Protestant Divines. *Aquinas* saith, *Eternity of punishment is due to every Sin of the unregenerate, ratione conditionis subjecti*, in respect of the state of him that commits *it, who wants that Grace whereby Sin is only remitted.* And *Cajetan* upon those words of *Aquinas*, tells us, that *Grace is the only fountain whence floweth remission of Sin, and nothing maketh Sin venial or remissible, but to be in Grace; and that nothing maketh Sin irremissible and not venial, but the being out of a state of Grace*; and that which maketh Sin *Venial or not Venial, is the state of the subject wherein 'tis found.* For if we respect the nature of Sin as 'tis in it self, it will remain (without grace) eternally in stain and guilt, and so will subject the Sinner to eternal punishment, and is mortal. So that *remissibility or irremissibility of Sins must not be considered according to the sins themselves, but according to the subjects being, or not being in the state of Grace.* *Fisher* Bishop of *Rochester*, though a most bitter adversary to *Luther*, yet concerning the *Veniality of Sin*, he thus speaks to *Luther*; *In this that Sin is Venial by the mercy of God, I am*, Luther, *wholly of thy mind.* *Azorius* confesseth, *That the remission of Venial Sin is of a free and supernatural benefit, and afforded to none that are not in a state of Grace.*

Peccato non debetur pœna æterna ratione suæ gravitatis, sed ratione conditionis subjecti, scilicet hominis, qui sine gratiâ invenitur, per quam solum fit remissio pœnæ. *Aquin.* 1,2. Qu. 87. *Art.* 5. *ad* 1. *p. mihi* 275.

Sola gratia est principium remissionis pœnæ. Remissibilitas, & irremissibilitas tam culpæ quàm pœnæ attenduntur penes statum subjecti, scil. esse in gratiâ vel non, statui gratiæ convenit remissibilitas positive, statui vero culpæ extra gratiam convenit irremissibilitas positive. *Cajet. in loc. prædict. p. mihi* 275. Quòd peccatum veniale solum ex misericordiâ Dei veniale sit, hoc ego tecum, *Luthere*, sentio. *Contra Luther. Art.* 32. Venialis remissio peccati, gratuitum & supernaturale est beneficium Dei, nemini extra gratiam Dei constituto peccatum veniale dimittitur. *Azor. l.* 4. *c.* 10. Nisi quia est ab homine justo Dei gratia & charitate prædito commissum, perpetuo puniretur. *Azor. l.* 3. *c.* 9.

Thus far are our *Concessions* concerning the Veniality of Sin, or our granting what is not to be denied, which was the *first* part of my Explication; I come now to the *second Branch* of Explication, which is to be by way of *Negation*, or denial of what is not to be granted.

2d. Branch. of Explicat.

That which I peremptorily *deny* is this, *That any Sins are exempted from deserving eternal punishment, upon the account of any imaginary, or imaginable smalness or levity of Sin.*

Agnoscimus quorundam deliria, qui, quod dicitur de alieno corio sunt liberales, sultitiam debitorum qui adversus creditorem suum, judicium proferunt propriâ causâ. Certè reus qui coram judice suo culpam extenuat, cum res tota judici perspecta est, imprudenter valde se gerit, nec minus stultè facit, qui debitum suum vel negat, vel minuit apud eum qui convincere potest & cogere. *Rivet. Sum. contr. Tr. quart. Quæst.* 13.

'Tis ingeniously exprest by Learned *Rivet* in his *Catholicus Ortho-*

doxus,

doxus, againſt *Baily* the Jeſuite upon this occaſion, *That there are ſome who de alieno corio ſunt liberales, cut large thongs out of an Hide that's none of their own*, That (he means) of Gods mercy; who meaſure Gods *judgment* according to their own *rule*; and like *fooliſh debtors* will be judges of their own cauſe againſt their Creditor. *That guilty Malefactor* (ſaith he gravely) *is unwiſe, who extenuates his fault before his Judg, to whom his whole cauſe is known; nor is it leſs imprudent to diminiſh our Sins before that God, who can both convincere & cogere, convince us of our debts, and compel us to make ſatisfaction. Bellarmine* then and his Complices are none of the wiſeſt or honeſteſt, who dictate to us, that ſome Sins are ſo *light and little*, that they deſerve no eternal puniſhment, but are *Venial*; 1. Some *in genere ſuo*, in their kind of Sin, as when the Will is carried out to that, which contains in it ſelf a *kind of inordination indeed, but yet ſuch as is not contrary either to the love of God or our Neighbour, as an officious lie, or an idle word*; and that, 2. Some Sins are *Venial ex imperfectione operis*, by *the imperfection of the work*: and theſe (ſaith *Bellarmine*) are of two ſorts; 1. Some are Venial *ex ſurreptione*, by their unexpected *ſtealth and creeping* into the Soul, and theſe are *ſudden motions of luſts, anger, revenge, &c. which get into the mind before reaſon can deliberate, whether they are to be admitted or no*; and ſo they are not *perfecte voluntaria, have not the full conſent of the Will.* 2. Other Sins are *Venial* by the *imperfection* of the matter, *ex parvitate materiæ*, which are *committed in a light and ſmall matter*; as the *ſtealing of an half-peny*, which neither hurts our Neighbour, nor deſtroys Love. Againſt theſe we oppoſe, That *there's no Sin but deſerves eternal puniſhment. per propriam naturam & intrinſecam rationem*, by its own proper and intrinſecal nature. As the leaſt drop of water is water, as truly as the whole Sea, ſo the leaſt Sin is as truly Sin as the greateſt; and the leaſt Sin according to the *rigour of the Law* deſerves an everlaſting penalty. The imperfection of Sin as to *degree*, takes not away from it either the *reaſon* of Sin, or the *merit* of penalty, as *Medina*, *Azorius*, *Durand*, and others confeſs. *Azorius* tells us from *Durand*, *Vega*, *Cajetan*; That the Law of God *forbids Venial Sins, even all Sin both great and ſmall*; and that the Arguments of the Proteſtants prove, that *Venial Sin* is againſt the Law of God. To which I add, that it implys a groſs *contradiction*. to ſay that the *leaſt* Sin ſhould be ſaid to be a *Sin*, and yet to be *Venial* and deſerve pardon; for if it deſerves *pardon*, then alſo *freedom* from *puniſhment*, and if *freedom* from *puniſhment*, then it hath no *guilt*, and if it have no *guilt*, then it is no *Sin*. Moſt true is that ſpeech of *Altenſtaig*, in his *Lexicon Theologicum*; *Nullum peccatum habet rationem ad merendam veniam, imo potius demeretur*; *Sin as Sin cannot deſerve to be pardoned, but it deſerves not to be pardoned.* Nor can *Bellarmine* with his Sophiſtry prove, that the *ſmall* Sins before mention'd, are in their nature *Venial*: 'Tis little leſs than blaſphemy what he dictates concerning a Sin Venial, *ex genere ſuo*, as an *idle word, an officious lie, &c.* that

Vid. *Bellar.* l. 1. de amiſ. Grat. cap. 3.

Vid. *Medin.* in 1, 2. *Q.* 88. a. 1. *Azor.* l. 4. c. 8. *Durand q.* 6. Dicendum eſt ut docuerunt *Durandus*, *Cajetanus* & *Vega*, veniale peccatum eſt quidem contra legem Dei, quia revera lex Dei prohibet & gravia & levia, id quod adverſariorum argumenta comprobarunt. *Azor. Inſt. Mor.* l. 4. c. 8. *Altenſt.* Sub Tit. peccatum.

it

it is *not* againſt a *perfect* and a rigorous Law; that the Law which *forbids* it, is not perfectly *a Law*, and hath not perfectly *rationem legis*: But this is falſe (to ſay no worſe): For *that Law* truly binds the Conſcience to *perform it*, and therefore 'tis *truly a Law*; and that it truly binds the Conſcience, is clear, both becauſe it is *made by him* who hath *jus leges condendi*, *a right of making Laws*, and alſo becauſe it hath *a ſanction*, a threat, *viz.* the giving *an account*; and *condemnation* alſo, *Mat.* 12. 31. And when *Bellarmine* argues that Sins which he calls *venial ex ſurreptione*, by ſtealth into the Soul *unawares*, are not perfectly *voluntary*, and therefore are *venial*; 1. 'Tis acutely obſerved by the learned *Chamier*, *That a ſin may be by ſurreption, or inconſiderateneſs, and yet it may be voluntary alſo, ſurreption not being properly oppoſed to voluntarineſs, but to election, when upon weighing of circumſtances a thing is choſen; for it often falls out, that the will is carried to a thing, though by a ſudden and inconſiderate motion, as* Peter *deny'd Chriſt with his will, though ſuddenly, and inconſiderately, and yet thereby* Peter *committed a mortal ſin*: And though a Sin of *ſurreption* be not voluntary in the *higheſt degree*, yet is it with a true and proper conſent, (as *Ames* ſpeaks). 2. But beſides, the *nature* of Sin, its *formale* or that wherein it conſiſts, is not its *voluntarineſs*, *but its tranſgreſſion of the Law.* The *Law of* the *Creator*, not the *will of* the *creature*, is the Rule of right and wrong. *Voluntarineſs aggravates, but involuntarineſs excuſeth not Sin.* 3. 'Tis excellently obſerved by the learned *Davenant*, *That may be ſaid to be voluntary, not only which is committed with an expreſs and actual willingneſs, but that which is not hindred by the will when it is bound to hinder it; but the will is bound to command its reaſon, that it ſhould be wakeful and watchful, to ſuppreſs all the motions of inordinate concupiſcence.* 4. Further, doth not the Law prohibit and condemn all affections and motions, whether *deliberate* or by *ſurreption* and *indeliberate*? and hence it was, 5. That holy *Paul* complaining of the Sin that *dwelt in him*, Rom. 7. 19. was *afflicted*, not only for the *deliberate motions of ſin*, but alſo for thoſe that were *indeliberate* and *involuntary*; and would he have *mourned* under them, if they had not been *ſinful?* To conclude this, Doth not, ſixthly, the *ſurreption* and indeliberate *ſtealing* of depraved motions into the Soul, proceed *a pravitate damnabili*, from *a damnable and depraved principle* of nature? muſt it not then be ſinful and depraved alſo?

Surreptionem exiſtimamus opponi, non voluntati, ſed τῇ προαιρέσει, id eſt, electioni, cum omnibus cognitis, penſitatiſque circumſtantiis, unum eligitur denique; nam ſæpe accidit ut motu ſubitaneo, & inconſiderato voluntas ipſa ad aliquid feratur; ut voluntate *Petrus* negavit ſed ſubitaneâ, & peccavit tamen etiam mortaliter: Itaque & hæc quoq; quæ per ſurreptionem fiunt, voluntaria ſunt, ideoque & peccata, verè, inquam peccata. *Chamier l. 6. c.* 10.

Eſt voluntarium non quidem in ſummo gradu, ſed vero & proprio conſenſu, *Ames, Bellarm. Enerv. de pec. ven. pag. mihi* 16. Voluntarium reputatur, non modò quod expreſſâ & actuali voluntate committitur, ſed quod ab ipſa voluntate non impeditur, quando tenetur impedire. Tenetur autem voluntas imperare rationi, ut pervigil ſit in comprimendis omnibus inordinatæ concupiſcentiæ motibus. *Davenant* Q. 31. *Determ. p. mihi*, 145.

And when *Bellarmine* argues for the *Veniality* of Sin from the *parvitas materiæ*, the *ſmalneſs* and *ſlightneſs* of the *matter* in which Sin is committed, as the *ſtealing of an half-penny*, or a penny; I wiſh he had remembred, That

That according to this Doctrine, if *Bellarmine* should steal a Peny from his poor Neighbour ten thousand several times, he should not yet after all, commit a Mortal Sin; since if the stealing of *one penny* be but a *venial* Sin, ten thousand Venial Sins cannot make up or amount to one Mortal Sin. Besides, the smalness of the matter in which a sin is committed, is so far from extenuating, that it often aggravates the sin committed; as 'tis a greater sin to murder a man for Sixpence than for an hundred pounds, to deny my starving Friend a peny-Loaf, than twenty Seam of Wheat; and thus Divines commonly aggravate *Adams* Sin by his breaking the Command of God in so small a matter as was the *forbidden fruit*. And whereas *Bellarmine* tells us that the stealing of an half-peny or a peny is not *against the Law*, because (saith he) *Lex non diserte prohibet furtum oboli, The Law doth not expresly mention any prohibition of stealing an half-peny or a peny*. What if I should ask Cardinal *Robert*, whether the Law any where expresly forbids the stealing of *a thousand pounds*? and whether the stealing of such a Sum is therefore *not against the Law*, because the Law *expresly* forbids it not? Doth not the *general* prohibition of *Theft* contain under it, all *the kinds of Theft*? Doth not this Command, *Thou shalt not steal*, forbid the stealing of *any thing* that is anothers, whether the thing be *great or small*? even as the Law forbidding *Adultery*, forbids *that Sin with any* Woman, *noble or ignoble, rich or poor, bond or free*. In the overthrow of *Jericho* it was not expresly forbidden to steal *a Babilonish Garment*, or two hundred Shekels of Silver, or a *Wedg of Gold*; and yet because of the *general* prohibition *Achan* dyed for stealing that Garment, the two hundred Shekels of Silver, and the Wedg of God. Besides, that which violates one *apex or tittle* of the Law, breaks the Law and offends God. How deeply holy *Austin* was humbled for stealing of an Apple, though stoln when he was a *Child*, appears by his Confessions. Surely in *Bellarmines* Divinity, *Adams* taking but an *Apple*, and that from his *Wife*, was but a Venial fault. In Military Discipline, a Souldier is hang'd for stealing of a Trifle, or of what is of a very inconsiderable value. The stealing of the *least thing* is against a *great* both *Command and Commander*. And whereas *Bellarmine* argues, that the stealing of so small a thing as an *half-peny, hurts not* our Neighbour, and therefore 'tis Venial and not *forbidden*; 'Its answered, the Law forbids not only the *hurting* of our Neighbour, in forbidding to *Steal*, but it forbids the *violation of Justice too*. The Law forbids *inward lust*, but how doth *inward lust* hurt our Neighbour? God in his Commands respects his own *purity* as well as our Neighbours *utility*. Further, 'tis evident that the *veniality* of a Sin committed against our Neighbour, cannot be gathered from its not *hurting* him *; for in many Cases even *Bellarmine* will grant that a sin against our Neighbour is *damnable*, though it hurt not our Neighbour at all, yea though it prove very *profitable and advantageous* to him. Take an instance in this true Story. A worthy Physician, some years since, had

Vid. *Petrum Molinæum in Thesibus Sedanensibus.*

Josh. 6. 19. 7. 21.

* Josephs Brethren sinned mortally in selling their Brother, though by that selling him, he was highly advanced.

had a female Patient under Cure, to whom her leud Husband first gave the Foul Disease; and soon after, he gave her also a draught of rank Poison to kill her; but the Poyson meeting with the Distemper, by its violent operation overcame the Disease, and cured the Woman: According to *Bellarmines* Divinity, he should not, by giving her the poyson, have sinned mortally, because he was not only, by his murtherous endeavours, not hurtful, but very beneficial to his Wife. Still I follow *Bellarmine*, urging this Argument, That the stealing so small a thing *opposeth not Charity to man, or Love to God.* I answer, though a small Theft do not *expectorare* or *expugnare charitatem* (as Doctor *Davenant* expresseth it) destroys not Love & Charity, yet it doth *pugnare cum illa perfecta charitate*, oppose that perfect Love and Charity which the Law requireth; and it ariseth from that *inordinate lust* which the Law forbids, and which is contrary both to the *Law* and *Love* which the Law requireth. I add herein lyes the *great* mistake of *Bellarmine* in this point; in that he judgeth of the nature of mortal Sin by the *extinction of charity*, whereas it consists in any *swerving* or *declination* from the Law of God, and Charity. And when *Bellarmine* argues, That *præcepta de minimis non sunt proprie præcepta*; *Commands concerning the least things, are not properly Commands*: Besides that full answer I have formerly given, as to proving those Commands are most truly Commands, I cannot but here subjoyn that smart Expression of *Gerard*, who tells *Bellarmine*, thus arguing, *Satan himself was deficient in this Piece of* Bellarmines *Sophistry*; *and that Satan could not more speciously have covered his temptation to the eating the forbidden Fruit, than by saying, Tush, this is but a little Command, about a Trifle, an Apple, and indeed 'tis properly no Command at all.* And truly I should say, That *Bellarmine* might have *taught Satan* in this point, were it not that I look upon him in this, and in the greatest part of his Polemicks as taught, even to an *high* degree of proficiency, by that *School-Master*, both of *himself* and his *blackest Society*, I mean that of the Jesuits. As wild and weak is that Argument which *Bellarmine* grounds on that of *Luk.* 12. 59. *Thou shalt not depart thence, till thou hast paid the last mite.* Lo, here (saith *Bellarmine*) the last mite can intend nothing but some *small, venial sin* to be expiated in the Prison of *Purgatory*. But this bold Sophister perverts this Text, and plays too *saucily* with a most serious and *severe* Scripture. For by the *last mite* or farthing we must not understand *sins*, but the *punishments due* to sins, and the *minutissimas partes pœnarum*, the smallest parts of punishment in Hell. Thus the learnedst of, even Popish Expositors, expound that place; As *Brugensis* and *Jansenius*, who

Vid. *Thes. Sedan. nf. de pec. ven.* Neque illud rectè dicitur, hujusmodi peccata non pugnare cum charitate: Revera non expectorant, aut expugnant charitatem hominis renati; Sed pugnant tamen cum illâ perfectâ charitate, quam Lex imperat, & oriuntur ab illâ inordinata concupiscentiâ quæ est charitati, & legi divinæ contraria. *Davenant. ubi supr.*

In eo labuntur adversarii quod peccati naturam mortiferam ex solâ extinctione charitatis dijudicant, cum illa in qualibet declinatione a charitate & lege divinâ se exerat. *Id. ibid.* Gerard loc. Com. *c.* 19. de pec.

Serpentina diaboli primævos homines decipientis calliditas, non poterat speciosiori schemate pingi atque velari, quàm quòd primordialis illa lex de non comedendo arboris vetitæ fructu, sit præceptum, de re minima ac proinde non perfectè, & in rigore præceptum, cujus transgressio magnopere a Deo curetur. *Ger. de pec. Alt. c.* 19. *prope fin.* Ei qui non dederit operam ut redeat in gratiam cum læso a se fratre, contingit, ut carceri inferni traditus, sine aliquâ debiti remissione exactum jus experiatur. *Jansen.* in *Mat.* 5. 26. Sensus est, summo tecum jure agetur, non liberaberis donec pœnas lueris extremas, tantas quantas exiget extremus justitiæ rigor. *Brugens.* in *Mat.* 5. 26.

make,

make, and that truly, the meaning thereof to be this, *Thou shalt in the suffering of eternal punishment, pœnas luere extremas, quantas exhibet extremus justitiæ rigor; Thou shalt undergo the extremity and rigor of punishment from justice*: So that the *Prison* there mentioned, *v.* 58. is not meant of *Purgatory*, but of *Hell* (as *Tertullian* expressly saith) and *utter darkness* (as *Augustine*) and the payment of the *last mite* or farthing (as *Augustine* expounds it) imports as much, as *nihil relinquetur impunitum*, *No part of the punishment shall be abated*, but the wicked shall be there punished (as he expresseth it) *usque ad fœcem*, to the drinking the last drop and dregs of the Cup of Gods wrath. 'Tis but a wretched shift of *Bellarmine*, when he tells us that his *venial* or lesser sins, are not *contra*, but only *præter legem*, not against, but only *besides* the Law; by which distinction, this blasphemous Sophister not only falls foul upon *Andrew de Vega*, and other Papists, (whom he very roundly reproves for granting that *venial sins* are properly *against the* Law, telling them, That *upon that Principle, they can never mantain the possibility of a perfect impletion of the Law*, because (as he saith) they can never get off cleverly from that Scripture, *(he that offends in one is guilty of all)*; but which is worse, he audaciously wounds the purity and *perfection* of the Divine Law, to shelter his *venial* sins. Further (as that learned *Baronius* observes) were these *venial* small sins of *Bellarmine* only *besides*, and not *against* the Law, we ought not to call them *sins*, but *indifferent actions*, and so account them *lawful*; for that which is forbidden by no Law is *lawful*. And further, if this Doctrine were true, he that abstains from Venial sins, should do a work not of *precept*, but of *counsel* only, and so of *supererogation*, the Papists teaching that every good work not commanded by God, is a work of supererogation: But how absurd would this be to say, That by abstaining from a sin, a man doth a work of supererogation. I shall only add that Censure past upon *Bellarmine* by *Doctor Featly*, who saith, That here *Bellarmine* for saying some Sins are not against but only *besides* the Law, may well be accounted to be *besides himself*. And as for *Cotton* that proud Papist, who tells us there *is no proportion between eternal death, and an idle word*, and therefore an *idle word is not to be so severely punisht*! I answer, That as the great and righteous Judg of Sin and Sinners, is fitter to judg of the proportion between the *least Sin* and *eternal punishment*, than any weak and guilty Malefactor; So, the will of God forbidding any Sin under an eternal penalty, is a sufficient reason of that penalty, and makes the punishment proportionable to the demerit of the Sin. I shall only chastise the intolerable insolence of this Popeling by asking him one question, and 'tis but this, *What proportion is there between eternal death, and the eating a morsel of Flesh in Lent, or a Womans spinning a Yard of Thread on an holy day.* If you Papists forbid these under pain of damnation (as you do), and that meerly because the *Church* appoints it so, ye blind Hypocrites, may not *divine prohibition* be allowed to make a proportion between a Sin, and eternal punishment,

Serm. Dom. in Mont. l. 1.

L. 4. de justif. c. 14.

Jam. 2. 10. Videndum est illis quid respondeant Apostolo *Jacobo*, dicenti quicunque totam legem Servaveriat, offendatautem in uno, factus est omnium reus. *Bellar. de justif.* l. 4. c. 14. *Baron.* de pec. ven. p. 98.

punishment,

Non afferamus stateras dolosas, ubi appendamus quod volumus, & quomodo volumus pro arbitrio nostro, dicentes, hoc grave, hoc leve est, sed afferamus divinam stateram de Scripturis sanctis, & in illâ appendamus peccata vel potius à Domino appensa recognoscamus: *Cont. Donat. 2. 6.*

nishment; as well as that which is *Humane*, yea *Diabolical*; in the latter of which expressions I am not too severe, as long as we hold, 1 *Tim.* 4. 1, 2, 3. to be *Canonical*. The sum of all is but this; The *smalness* of Sin alters not the nature thereof. Its nature stands in this, that 'tis *against the Law:* If it be *not* prohibited, 'tis *no* Sin; If it be, 'tis *damnable* be it greater or smaller. I conclude this whole first part of my Discourse, its Explicatory part, with that holy and excellent advice of St. *Austin*, *Lib. 2. contr. Donatum. Non afferamus stateras dolosas*, &c. *Let us not bring deceitful Ballances to weigh in them what we will, and how we will according to our own pleasure, saying, this is heavy, this is light; but let us fetch a Divine Ballance out of the holy Scriptures, and in them let us weigh our Sins, or rather let us judg of them as they are there weighed.*

I have said what I intended as to the *Explication* of this great Truth, the denial of Venial Sin, both as to *Concession* and *Negation*; I proceed now to the *second Branch* of my Discourse about this Point, and that is the *Confirmation* of it.

And my first, and more immediately Scriptural Argument shall be this:

2d. Part.

Arg. 1. No Fault is Venial in it self, that deserves eternal death:
But every Sin deserves eternal death:
Therefore no Sin in it self is Venial.

The *first* Proposition or *major* is granted by the Papists, who tell us that the *nature* of Sins *Veniality*, stands in its *not* deserving eternal death; and therefore no Sin is Venial that deserves eternal death.

The *minor* or *second* Proposition, *viz.* that *every Sin deserves eternal death*, I shall clearly prove by Scriptures and reason.

1. By *Scriptures*; and I shall name three. The *first* is that which I named for my Text, *Rom. 6. 23. The wages of Sin is death.* The *second* is, *Ezek. 18. 4. The soul that sinneth shall die.* The *third* is that of *Deut. 27. 26. Cursed be he that continues not in all the words of this Law*, &c. To these Scriptures *Bellarmine* answers, but very miserably.

To that of *Rom. 6. 23. The wages of Sin is death*; *Bellarmine* answers, That when *Paul* saith, *The wages of Sin is death*; 'tis *only meant of Mortal Sin*, and thus is he to be understood, *The wages of Mortal Sin is death.* But I answer, with as good reason, in all the places of Scripture, wherein we are dehorted from Sin, he may cast this *shameful* gloss upon them, and say, that we are in them, dehorted not from *all* 1 Pet. 3. 11. *Sin* but only from *Mortal Sin*; as when the Scripture saith, *eschew evil*; *Bellarmine* may add this gloss, and say, we are not forbidden to shun *all* 1 Thes. 5. 22. *evil*, but only *Mortal* evil. And so when *Paul* saith, *abstain from all appearance of evil*; that is, as *Bellarmine* expounds it, abstain from all Rom. 12. 9. appearance of Mortal evil; and *Rom. 12. 9. abhor that which is evil*; *i.e.* Mortal evil; yea when we pray to be *deliver'd from evil*, that with *Bellarmines* comment, is only Mortal evil, *not all sin.* But further I would

ask

ask any Papist, only these two easie questions, 1. What is the meaning of these words, *Rom.*6.23. [*The wages of sin is death?*] The Papist will answer, by these words, the Apostle means [that *Sin deserves death.*] Let *Benedict Justinian* the Jesuit upon *Rom.*6.23. speak for all, who gives it thus, *by the desert of sin, eternal punishments are inflicted.* 2. I demand, What is the meaning of this word [*mortal*] when *Bellarmine* thus expounds this Text, the *wages of* [*mortal*] *Sin is death?* All the Papists with *Bellarmine* readily answer, that the meaning of a *mortal* Sin, is a *Sin that deserves death.* Now, Reader, be pleas'd to add to the Apostles Proposition *the wages of sin is death*, that is, *Sin deserves death*, *Bellarmines* Expolition, *the wages of* [*mortal*] *Sin is death*; That is, of a *Sin that deserves death*, and *Pauls* Proposition will be turn'd into a gross *Tautology*, and be made to speak thus, *Sin deserveth death that deserveth death*; a wretched depravation of the sacred Text, whereby they shew that rather than they will renounce a gross error, they will make the divinely-inspired Apostle, to speak gross non-sense. Besides, 'tis evident that in this sixth Chapter to the *Romans*, the Apostle dehorts the converted *Romans* from all Sin; particularly, *v.*2. *God forbid that we should continue in sin*; *and how shall we live any longer therein.* Now will any dare so wretchedly to interpret *Paul*, as to say that the Christians are here dehorted only from *some* Sins, and not from all? If any would offer so to expound the Apostle, I would instantly stop his mouth by two Arguments taken from the Context, wherein the Apostle dissuades from Sin *v.*3: 1. By a reason taken from being *baptized into the death of Christ*; now when we are so baptized, is not *all* Sin washt away and destroyed? And 2. the Apostle useth another reason to dissuade from continuing in Sin, and that is, the consideration of their *former yielding* themselves to Sin; Whence he argues, They ought now as much to serve *Righteousness* as formerly they had served *Sin*, *v.*19; whence 'twill follow, That as they had formerly served not only greater but smaller Sins, so now they ought to cast off the latter as well as the former, even all Sin whatsoever. Now if *Paul* by these two Arguments dehorts from *all Sin*, why should he not then do so by this next Argument, *viz.* the *issue of Sin*, the *wages of Sin is death?*

Sempiterni cruciatus peccati merito reddantur. *Bened. Just. in Rom.* 6. *p.*191.

As to that place of *Ezek.* 18.4. *The soul that sinneth, it shall die*; *Bellarmine* answers, The Prophet only intends that threat against *Mortal Sins*, grievous and hainous abominations, not against *smaller Sins* which he calls *Venial.* But he abuseth the Scripture, for the Prophet there setting down the *standing rule* of Divine Justice, that none should die but for *his own Sins*, makes no exception of *lesser Sins* from being within the compass of that *Commination*, not saying the Soul that *grievously* sins, but the Soul that *sins*, shall die. *Universe dictum est*, 'tis universally expresst as *Pareus* notes; but to put all out of doubt, that *lesser* as well as *greater sins*, are threatned to be punisht with death by the Prophet, 'tis plain from the 31. *vers.* of that Chapter, where the Prophet

plainly declares his meaning to be of Sin in *general* without any *restriction*; *Cast away from you* (saith he) *ALL your transgressions, and make you a new heart, for why will ye die?* All Sins therefore which opposed a *new heart*, are they commanded to cast away, and are here clearly discovered to be deadly.

To that place of *Deut.* 27. 26. *Cursed be he that confirmeth not all the words of this Law to do them*; *Bellarmine* still gives the old answer: By the *words of this Law* (saith he) are not meant the words of the *whole Law*; as if God had threatned a curse against *all Sins* in general, but only of *Mortal Sins*, some *grosser Sins of Murder, Incest, Idolatry, &c.* But this is a *cursed* gloss put upon a Divine *curse*; for the words here used, *the words of this Law*, are the same with those of Verse the 8*th.* where the very same expression *the words of this Law*, intend the words of the *whole Law*; and evident it is that here all those Sins are intended which are opposed to *Legal Righteousness*, *Do this and live*; but such are all Sins in general. But the Apostle whom I ever took for a *better Expositor* of Scripture than either *Bellarmine* or the *Pope*, leaves no place for dispute in this matter, who *Gal.* 3. 10. citing this very place of *Deuteronomy*, denounceth the Curse, not against those that commit *some gross Sins* against *some* part of the Law, but against those that *continue not in all things that are written in the book of the Law*; *i.e.* those that commit any Sin whatever.

Thus I have made good by *Scripture* this Proposition, *viz. Every Sin deserves eternal death.* I shall now proceed to prove it by two *Reasons*; the first whereof is this:

Every Transgression of the Law deserves eternal death;
Every Sin is a Transgression of the Law:
Therefore every Sin deserves eternal death.

The *second* Proposition, or *minor*, That every *Sin is the transgression of the Law*, is contain'd in the express words of Scripture, 1 *Joh.* 3. 4. where Sin is call'd *the transgression of the Law*, from which every Sin is a swerving, and thence hath its both nature and name also; and 'tis granted by the learnedst among the Papists, that all Sins, even Venial are *against the Law*; so *Durand*, *Gerson*, *Vega*, *Azorius*, *Cajetan*, with others. And *Augustin's* old definition of Sin, that 'tis *dictum, factum concupitum contra legem*; that *Sin is that which is either said, done*, or *desir'd against the Law*, falls in with them, or rather they with it; and therefore *Bellarmines* distinction of some *Sins* that are only *præter, beside*, and not *contra, against* the Law is grosly false; for if *all* Sins are *forbidden* by, all Sins are *contrary* to, the Law.

The *major* or *first* Proposition, That every *transgression* of the Law deserves eternal death, is most certain: But I prove it thus.

Whatever deserves *the Curse of the Law*, deserves eternal death; but every Transgression of the Law deserves *the Curse of the Law*: Therefore every Transgression of the Law deserves eternal death.

The

The *major* or first Proposition cannot be deny'd unless we will hold that the Curse of the Law, only contains *temporal* evils, which is horridly false; for if that were true, then Christ hath not delivered us from eternal death by *delivering* us from the *Curse of the Law.*

The *minor* or second Proposition, That every *Transgression of the Law* deserves *the Curse of the Law*, I prove from that clear and full Scripture. *Gal.* 3. 10. *Cursed is every one that continues not in all things that are written in the Book of the Law to do them.* According to the rigor of the Law, the least breach thereof makes us cursed, and this was the Laws unsupportable burden, that when we were bound to do *all* things in the Law, and were unable to do them, we were yet cursed for not doing them.

2. My *second* reason to prove that *every* Sin deserves eternal death is this;

That which deserves an *infinite* punishment deserves eternal death; but every Sin deserves an *infinite* punishment: Therefore every Sin deserves eternal death.

The *major* or first Proposition is deny'd by none, there being no infinity of punishment mention'd, or imagin'd, but in that call'd in Scripture *eternal death.*

The minor or second Proposition, that every Sin deserves an *infinite* punishment, I thus prove:

If *Christ* laid down an infinite price to *redeem us from every Sin*, then every Sin deserves an *infinite* punishment; but *Christ* laid down an infinite price to redeem us from every Sin:

Therefore every Sin deserves an infinite punishment.

The consequence is evident, That if *Christ* laid down an infinite price for every Sin, then every Sin deserves an infinite punishment, because it had been an unjust exacting of punishment upon Christ, had there been required of him the laying down of an *infinite price* for a *finite evil*, that required only a finite punishment to be inflicted for it.

The minor or second Proposition, *viz.* That *Christ* laid down an *infinite price* to redeem us *from every Sin*, is undeniable by those that will neither deny Scriptures nor Catechisms: For that *Christ* redeem'd us by an *infinite price*, hath not only the consent, but 'tis the ground of the comfort of all Christians. *Infinitas personæ facit infinitatem pretii*, an infinite person made the price of infinite value. And that *Christ* laid down this *infinite* price for *all* Sins, is with the like consent and comfort embraced by all that believe the Scriptures aright, which abound in Texts that express it, *Psal.* 130. *ult. He shall redeem Israel from all his iniquities.* 1 Joh. 1. 7. *The blood of Christ cleanseth from all Sin.* Tit. 2. 14. *He gave himself that he might redeem us from all iniquity.* Hence *Hos.* 14. 2. 'twas a prayer of Faith, *Take away all iniquity*; and *Isa.* 53. 10. *The Lord hath laid upon him the iniquity of us all*; and *Joh.* 1. 19. *The Lamb of God that takes away the sin of the World*; and *Mat.* 1. 21.

1. 21. *He shall save his people from their sins*; from every Sin, and every Sin perfectly.

2d. *Arg.* My second Argument to prove that no Sin is venial, is this:

Whatsoever is contrary to the loving of God *with the whole heart*, is not Venial but Mortiferous;

But every Sin is contrary to the loving of God *with our whole heart*:

Therefore every Sin is Mortal, and so not Venial.

The *first* Proposition or *major* is undeniable; because he that loves not God with *his whole heart*, *sins* against the express words of the command, *Mat.* 22. 37. And the *loving God with all the heart*, is call'd *the great command*, and is prefer'd before the *love of our neighbour by Christ*, *Mat.* 22. 38, 39. Since therefore there are many commands of love to *our neighbour*, which cannot be violated but we must needs Sin mortally (as the Papists grant), 'twill evidently follow, That a transgression of the command of loving God with *all the heart*, must needs be a Mortal Sin.

The *second* Proposition or *minor*, That *every Sin* opposeth the loving of God *with all the heart*, and that whoever sins, loves not God with *all the heart*, is as true as the former.

Bellarmine therefore dares not here answer by denying this truth absolutely; but by a lame and lamentable distinction, he answers here, That to love God *with all the heart*, may be taken two ways:

Non Prælatione. 1. To love God so intirely and perfectly as that nothing is *prefer'd before* Gods love; and this love of God (saith *Bellarmine*) is both the meaning of the command, and such alone also which Venial Sins do not oppose.

Non Admissione. 2. To love God so perfectly as that a man is so *wholly* taken up with the love of God, that no sinful and vicious thought at any time can creep or steal into a persons heart: But (saith *Bellarmine*) such a love of God as *this*, is not commanded in this life, and this love of God he confesseth is oppos'd by Venial Sins. For answer to this impious distinction of *Bellarmine*, 'tis both most *false* and *frivolous*.

1. As he tells us that 'tis not necessary to the love of God with all the soul, that all vicious thoughts be hindred from *admission* into a man; for this is clearly oppos'd not only by St. *Austin* of old, but by others, even Papists of late. St. *Austin* tells us, That *to love God with all the soul, is to confer all the life, thoughts and understanding upon him, from whom we have them all, and to suffer no part of the life to give way to be willing to enjoy any thing else, but whatsoever else comes into the mind to be*

Diliges Deum ex toto corde, & ex totâ animâ, & ex totâ mente; *i.e.* omnes cogitationes, omnem vitam, & omnem intellectum in illum conferas, à quo habes ea ipsa quæ confers. Quum autem ait toto corde, totâ animâ, tota mente, nullam vitæ nostræ partem reliquit, quæ vacare debet, & quasi locum dare, ut aliâ re velit frui; sed quicquid aliud diligendum venerit in animum, illuc rapiatur quo totius dilectionis impetus currit. *August. Lib.* 1. *de Doctr. Christ. cap.* 22.

loved

loved, is to be carried thither. Victor expresseth it thus; *A man should burn with so hot a love to God, that nothing should creep into any faculty of the Soul, that either diminisheth love to God, or carries it any whither else. Anselm* excellently thus, on *Mat.* 22. *In the Understanding no place is to be left for Error; in the Will nothing is to be willed contrary to God; in the whole memory nothing is to be remembred whereby we may the less think of him. Aquinas* thus also; *A man must so love God, if with all the heart, as to subject himself to him*, and follow the rule of his *Commandments in all things; for whatsoever is contrary to his Law, is contrary to his Love.*

Hominem tanto Dei amore flagrare debere commonstrat, ut nihil prorsus in ullam animæ facultatem irrepere sinat quod suam erga Deum dilectionem diminuat aut

alio transferat. *Vict.* in *Mar.* 12. In intellectu nullam relinquas errori locum: In voluntate nihil velis illi contrarium, in memoria tuâ nihil reminiscens quo minus de illo sentias. *Anselm* in *Mat.* 22. Est de ratione charitatis, quòd homo sic diligat Deum, ut velit se in omnibus ei subjicere, & regulam præceptorum ejus in omnibus sequi, quicquid enim contrariatur præceptis ejus, contrariatur charitati. *Thom.* 2da. 2dæ. Q. 24. *Art.* 12.

Alvarez expresly opposeth *Bellarmine* in these words; *To love God is to admit nothing into the heart contrary to God. Theophylact* most fully; *To love God with all the heart is to cleave to him with all the parts and faculties of the Soul; to give our selves wholly to God, and to subject the nutritive, sensitive, and rational faculty to his love.* Now according to these Explications of the Love of God, the *least Sins* (which Papists call *Venial*) are contrary to it; for in them there's not *a pleasing of God in all* things, not a *forsaking of all things contrary to his will*; yea in these Venial Sins there's an *admission of a contrary* and unlawful *Love* of the Creature into the heart, and not a total *subjecting* thereof to God.

Diligere Deum est nihil in corde divinæ dilectioni contrarium admittere. *Alvarez Lib. 6. de Auxil. div. Grat. disp. 51. Sect. 4.* Ἀγαπᾶν τὸν θεὸν ὅλοφύχως, τοῦτο ἐστὶ τὸ διὰ παντὸς τῶν ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ μερῶν καὶ δυνάμεων αὐτῷ προσέχειν ὡς ὅλας ἑαυτὰς ὀφείλομεν δεδόναι τῷ θεῷ, καὶ ὑποτάττειν, καὶ τὴν θρεπτικὴν, καὶ τὴν αἰσθητικὴν, καὶ διανοητικὴν ἡμῶν δύναμιν τῇ ἀγάπῃ τοῦ θεοῦ. Theophil. in Mat. 22.

But, secondly, in every Venial Sin, there's the *preferring* of something *before* God, and therefore a manifest *transgressing* of the Law of loving God. As to a *formal* and *explicite* preferring the Creature before God, so as to account the Creature a more excellent Good than God is, this all those do not, that live in the grossest and most *mortal* wickednesses, (as the Papists acknowledg); for men may live even in the hainous Sin of Persecution, and yet think thereby they serve and set up God: But as to a *virtual* and *interpretative* preferring the Creature before God, this men do in the least Sins; they *carrying* themselves so, as if the Creature were to be prefer'd before God, they fearing not for the love of the Creature to offend God, and injuriously to his Justice, to break his Commandments. And how may a man be said to shew by his *carriage*, more respect to the Creature than to God; if not by breaking the *Commands* of God and *contemning his will* for the Creature. To shun the dint of this Answer, the Papists are forced to this wretched shift, which is

plainly declares his meaning to be of Sin in *general* without any *restriction*; *Cast away from you* (saith he) *ALL your transgressions, and make you a new heart, for why will ye die?* All Sins therefore which opposed a *new heart*, are they commanded to cast away, and are here clearly discovered to be deadly.

To that place of *Deut.* 27. 26. *Cursed be he that confirmeth not all the words of this Law to do them*; *Bellarmine* still gives the old answer: By the *words of this Law* (saith he) are not meant the words of the *whole Law*; as if God had threatned a curse against *all Sins* in general, but only of *Mortal Sins*, some *grosser Sins of Murder, Incest, Idolatry, &c.* But this is a *cursed* gloss put upon a Divine *curse*; for the words here used, *the words of this Law*, are the same with those of Verse the 8*th.* where the very same expression *the words of this Law*, intend the words of the *whole Law*; and evident it is that here all those Sins are intended which are opposed to *Legal Righteousness*, *Do this and live*; but such are all Sins in general. But the Apostle whom I ever took for a *better Expositor* of Scripture than either *Bellarmine* or the *Pope*, leaves no place for dispute in this matter, who *Gal.* 3. 10. citing this very place of *Deuteronomy*, denounceth the Curse, not against those that commit *some gross Sins* against *some* part of the Law, but against those that *continue not in all things that are written in the book of the Law*; *i.e.* those that commit any Sin whatever.

Thus I have made good by *Scripture* this Proposition, *viz. Every Sin deserves eternal death.* I shall now proceed to prove it by two *Reasons*; the first whereof is this:

Every Transgression of the Law deserves eternal death;
Every Sin is a Transgression of the Law:
Therefore every Sin deserves eternal death.

The *second* Proposition, or *minor*, That every *Sin is the transgression of the Law*, is contain'd in the express words of Scripture, 1 *Joh.* 3. 4. where Sin is call'd *the transgression of the Law*, from which every Sin is a swerving, and thence hath its both nature and name also; and 'tis granted by the learnedst among the Papists, that all Sins, even Venial are *against the Law*; so *Durand*, *Gerson*, *Vega*, *Azorius*, *Cajetan*, with others. And *Augustin's* old definition of Sin, that 'tis *dictum, factum concupitum contra legem*; that *Sin is that which is either said, done*, or *desir'd against the Law*, falls in with them, or rather they with it; and therefore *Bellarmines* distinction of some *Sins* that are only *præter, beside*, and not *contra, against* the Law is grosly false; for if *all* Sins are *forbidden* by, all Sins are *contrary* to, the Law.

The *major* or *first* Proposition, That every *transgression* of the Law deserves eternal death, is most certain: But I prove it thus.

Whatever deserves *the Curse of the Law*, deserves eternal death; but every Transgression of the Law deserves *the Curse of the Law*: Therefore every Transgression of the Law deserves eternal death.

The

The *major* or first Proposition cannot be deny'd unless we will hold that the Curse of the Law, only contains *temporal* evils, which is horridly false; for if that were true, then Christ hath not delivered us from eternal death by *delivering* us from the *Curse of the Law.*

The *minor* or second Proposition, That every *Transgression of the Law* deserves *the Curse of the Law*, I prove from that clear and full Scripture. *Gal.* 3. 10. *Cursed is every one that continues not in all things that are written in the Book of the Law to do them.* According to the rigor of the Law, the least breach thereof makes us cursed, and this was the Laws unsupportable burden, that when we were bound to do *all* things in the Law, and were unable to do them, we were yet cursed for not doing them.

2. My *second* reason to prove that *every* Sin deserves eternal death is this;

That which deserves an *infinite* punishment deserves eternal death; but every Sin deserves an *infinite* punishment: Therefore every Sin deserves eternal death.

The *major* or first Proposition is deny'd by none, there being no infinity of punishment mention'd, or imagin'd, but in that call'd in Scripture *eternal death.*

The minor or second Proposition, that every Sin deserves an *infinite* punishment, I thus prove:

If *Christ* laid down an infinite price to *redeem us from every Sin*, then every Sin deserves an *infinite* punishment; but *Christ* laid down an infinite price to redeem us from every Sin:

Therefore every Sin deserves an infinite punishment.

The consequence is evident, That if *Christ* laid down an infinite price for every Sin, then every Sin deserves an infinite punishment, because it had been an unjust exacting of punishment upon Christ, had there been required of him the laying down of an *infinite price* for a *finite evil*, that required only a finite punishment to be inflicted for it.

The minor or second Proposition, *viz.* That *Christ* laid down an *infinite price* to redeem us *from every Sin*, is undeniable by those that will neither deny Scriptures nor Catechisms: For that *Christ* redeem'd us by an *infinite price*, hath not only the consent, but 'tis the ground of the comfort of all Christians. *Infinitas personæ facit infinitatem pretii*, an infinite person made the price of infinite value. And that *Christ* laid down this *infinite* price for *all* Sins, is with the like consent and comfort embraced by all that believe the Scriptures aright, which abound in Texts that express it, *Psal.* 130. *ult. He shall redeem Israel from all his iniquities.* 1 Joh. 1. 7. *The blood of Christ cleanseth from all Sin.* Tit. 2. 14. *He gave himself that he might redeem us from all iniquity.* Hence *Hos.* 14. 2. 'twas a prayer of Faith, *Take away all iniquity*; and *Isa.* 53. 10. *The Lord hath laid upon him the iniquity of us all*; and *Joh.* 1. 19. *The Lamb of God that takes away the sin of the World*; and *Mat.*

1. 21.

1. 21. *He shall save his people from their sins*; from every Sin, and every Sin perfectly.

2d. *Arg.* My second Argument to prove that no Sin is venial, is this:

Whatsoever is contrary to the loving of God *with the whole heart*, is not Venial but Mortiferous;

But every Sin is contrary to the loving of God *with our whole heart:*

Therefore every Sin is Mortal, and so not Venial.

The *first* Propolition or *major* is undeniable; because he that loves not God with *his whole heart*, *sins* against the expres words of the command, *Mat.* 22. 37. And the *loving God with all the heart*, is call'd *the great command*, and is prefer'd before the *love of our neighbour by Christ*, *Mat.* 22. 38, 39. Since therefore there are many commands of love to *our neighbour*, which cannot be violated but we must needs Sin mortally (as the Papists grant), 'twill evidently follow, That a transgression of the command of loving God with *all the heart*, must needs be a Mortal Sin.

The *second* Proposition or *minor*, That *every Sin* opposeth the loving of God *with all the heart*, and that whoever sins, loves not God with *all the heart*, is as true as the former.

Bellarmine therefore dares not here answer by denying this truth absolutely; but by a lame and lamentable distinction, he answers here, That to love God *with all the heart*, may be taken two ways:

Non Prælatione. 1. To love God so intirely and perfectly as that nothing is *prefer'd before* Gods love; and this love of God (saith *Bellarmine*) is both the meaning of the command, and such alone also which Venial Sins do not oppose.

Non Admissione. 2. To love God so perfectly as that a man is so *wholly* taken up with the love of God, that no sinful and vicious thought at any time can creep or steal into a persons heart: But (saith *Bellarmine*) such a love of God as *this*, is not commanded in this life, and this love of God he confesseth is oppos'd by Venial Sins. For answer to this impious distinction of *Bellarmine*, 'tis both most *false* and *frivolous*.

1. As he tells us that 'tis not necessary to the love of God with all the soul, that all vicious thoughts be hindred from *admission* into a man; for this is clearly oppos'd not only by St. *Austin* of old, but by others, even Papists of late. St. *Austin* tells us, That *to love God with all the soul, is to confer all the life, thoughts and understanding upon him, from whom we have them all, and to suffer no part of the life to give way to be willing to enjoy any thing else, but whatsoever else comes into the mind to be*

Diliges Deum ex toto corde, & ex totâ animâ, & ex totâ mente; *i.e.* omnes cogitationes, omnem vitam, & omnem intellectum in illum conferas, à quo habes ea ipsa quæ confers. Quum autem ait toto corde, totâ animâ, tota mente, nullam vitæ nostræ partem reliquit, quæ vacare debet, & quasi locum dare, ut aliâ re velit frui; sed quicquid aliud diligendum venerit in animum, illuc rapiatur quo totius dilectionis impetus currit. *August. Lib.* 1. *de Doctr. Christ. cap.* 22.

loved

loved, is to be carried thither. Victor expresseth it thus; *A man should burn with so hot a love to God, that nothing should creep into any faculty of the Soul, that either diminisheth love to God, or carries it any whither else. Anselm* excellently thus, on *Mat.* 22. *In the Understanding no place is to be left for Error; in the Will nothing is to be willed contrary to God, in the whole memory nothing is to be remembred whereby we may the less think of him. Aquinas* thus also; *A man must so love God, if with all the heart, as to subject himself to him,* and follow the rule of his *Commandments in all things; for whatsoever is contrary to his Law, is contrary to his Love.*

Hominem tanto Dei amore flagrare debere commonstrat, ut nihil prorsus in ullam animæ facultatem irrepere sinat quod suam erga Deum dilectionem diminuat aut alio transferat. *Vict.* in *Mar.* 12. In intellectu nullam relinquas errori locum: In voluntate nihil velis illi contrarium, in memoria tuâ nihil reminiscens quo minus de illo sentias. *Anselm* in *Mat.* 22. Est de ratione charitatis, quòd homo sic diligat Deum, ut velit se in omnibus ei subjicere, & regulam præceptorum ejus in omnibus sequi, quicquid enim contrariatur præceptis ejus, contrariatur charitati. *Thom. 2da. 2dæ. Q.* 24. *Art.* 12.

Alvarez expresly opposeth *Bellarmine* in these words; *To love God is to admit nothing into the heart contrary to God. Theophylact* most fully; *To love God with all the heart is to cleave to him with all the parts and faculties of the Soul; to give our selves wholly to God, and to subject the nutritive, sensitive, and rational faculty to his love.* Now according to these Explications of the Love of God, the *least Sins* (which Papists call *Venial*) are contrary to it; for in them there's not *a pleasing of God in all* things, not a *forsaking of all things contrary to his will*; yea in these Venial Sins there's an *admission of a contrary* and unlawful *Love* of the Creature into the heart, and not a total *subjecting* thereof to God.

Diligere Deum est nihil in corde divinæ dilectioni contrarium admittere. *Alvarez Lib. 6. de Auxil. Grat. disp. 51. Sect. 4.*

Ἀγαπᾶν τὸν θεὸν ὅλῃ τῇ ψυχῇ, τοῦτ' ἐστὶ τὸ διὰ παντὸς ἓν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ τῆς ψυχῆς μέρος καὶ δύναμιν ἀνῆκα πυρέχειν οἷς ὅλως ἑαυτοῖς ὀφείλομεν δίδοναι. τῷ θεῷ, καὶ καταπέμειν, καὶ τὴν θρεπτικὴν, καὶ τὴν αἰσθητικὴν, καὶ διανοητικὴν ἡμῶν δύναμιν τῇ ἀγάπῃ τῇ θεῷ. Theophil. in Mat. 22.

But secondly, in every Venial Sin, there's the *preferring* of something *before* God, and therefore a manifest *transgressing* of the Law of loving God. As to a *formal* and *explicite* preferring the Creature before God, so as to account the Creature a more excellent Good than God is, this all those do not, that live in the grossest and most *mortal* wickednesses, (as the Papists acknowledg); for men may live even in the hainous Sin of Persecution, and yet think thereby they serve and set up God: But as to a *virtual* and *interpretative* preferring the Creature before God, this men do in the least Sins; they *carrying* themselves so, as if the Creature were to be prefer'd before God, they fearing not for the love of the Creature to offend God, and injuriously to his Justice, to break his Commandments. And how may a man be said to shew by his *carriage*, more respect to the Creature than to God, if not by breaking the *Commands* of God and *contemning his will* for the Creature. To shun the dint of this Answer, the Papists are forced to this wretched shift, which is,

is to anſwer; That he who ſins Venially, prefers not the Creature before God, becauſe he knows that Venial Sins will not diſſolve that knot of love and friendſhip between God and him. But what a pittiful excuſe is this for Venial Sin, ſince (as *Baronius* well obſerves, *pag.* 106. *de pec. ven.*) They who commit Venial Sins, thinking theſe Sins will not diſſolve the favour of God, either think ſuch Sins are ſo light and ſlight that they *deſerve* not the diſſolution of Gods favour; or they think though they do deſerve that diſſolution, yet that God will *deal ſo graciouſly* with them, as that for ſuch Sins, he will not exclude them from his favour: If they think that they do not *deſerve* the diſſolution of Gods favour, they groſly err, yea *grievouſly ſin* againſt God, by judging their Sins to be light and little, and by a bold fixing of limits to Gods Juſtice; as if God could not juſtly puniſh their Sins with that penalty which he tells us they deſerve: But if they think that their Sins do deſerve the diſſolving of Gods favour, and that it is meerly from the Grace of God that they who commit them, are not excluded from it; then it follows, That they for the love of the Creature offending God by theſe Sins, prefer the Creature before God and his favour; for whoſoever for any Creature, dares do that which may juſtly exclude him from Gods favour, doth prefer the Creature before the favour of God: Nor doth their knowledg that theſe Sins do not exclude them from the favour of God, when yet they will commit them, extenuate or excuſe their contempt of Gods favour, of which they are guilty, but contrarily it aggravates that contempt; ſince though they know 'tis by Gods Grace and favour that their ſmaller Sins do not exclude them from his Love and Mercy, yet they abuſe the Clemency and Goodneſs of God to a licentiouſneſs in Sin, which is almoſt the higheſt contempt of Divine favour imaginable.

Arg. 3. My third Argument to prove, That no Sin is Venial, or deſerving to be pardon'd, ſhall be drawn from the *nature of pardon*; whence I thus argue.

An opinion that overthrows the *nature* of Gods *pardoning* of Sin, is impious and erroneous; But this opinion that ſome Sins are Venial and deſerve to be pardoned, doth thus *overthrow* the nature of *Gods pardoning of Sin:*

Therefore this opinion is impious and erroneous.

The *major* or *firſt* Propoſition is evident.

The *minor* or *ſecond* Propoſition I prove thus: If pardoning of Sin deſigns an act of *free Grace* and favour, in pardoning, which God according to *ſtrict juſtice*, might *not have done*; and if the Doctrine of Sins *Veniality* and deſerving to be pardoned, makes pardoning an *act of juſtice*, ſo that God cannot but in juſtice do it, then the opinion of Sins *Veniality* overthrows the Doctrine of Divine pardon:

But the pardoning of Sin deſigns an act of *free Grace and favour*, which God *might not have* done unleſs he had pleas'd; and the Doctrine

of

of Sins *Veniality* makes the pardoning of Sin an act of *Justice* which God *cannot but do*; therefore the Popish Doctrine of *Venial Sin*, overthrows the Doctrine of Divine pardon.

The *Major* or *first* Proposition is evident, and will be granted by all.

The *Minor* or *second* I prove thus in both its parts. As to its first part, 'tis most manifest that pardon designs an act of *free Grace and favour*; 'tis needless to multiply Scriptures (which to do were most easie) in so clear a point; *Ephes.* 1. 7. *Forgiveness of sin according to his grace.* *Psal.* 51. 1. *According to thy mercy blot out my transgressions.* 1 *Tim.* 1. 13. *I obtained mercy*, (saith *pardoned Paul.*)

Misericordia donatus sum. *Beza.*

For the second part of the *Minor*, that the Doctrine of the Papists about the *Veniality* of Sin, makes the pardoning of Sin an *act of justice*, which God *cannot but do* if he will do justly, is no slander cast upon the Papists in this Point. I pray let them be judg'd in this case, by their own confessions. The Council of *Mentz* professeth (as we heard) *That they cannot understand how God should be just, if he punish any for Venial Sins with eternal punishment.* *Sonnius*, the Papist I mean, tells us that Venial Sin is *Venia dignum*, Venial Sin is worthy of pardon. And *Bellarmine*, That they *hold with a general consent, that Venial Sins make not a man guilty of eternal death*; and he asserts with intolerable blasphemy, *That God should be unjust if he punisht Venial Sins eternally; justice requiring a forbearance to punish that offence which deserves not punishment.* From all which it follows, that Divine pardon is so far from being an act of *free Grace* in the account of a Papist, that when he recites his *Pater Noster*, if his Devotions agree with his Doctrines, he may rather say, Lord *pay* us, than *forgive* us our debts.

Bin. Tom. 9. c. 46.

Injustum est punire peccata venialia pœnâ æternâ: *Lib.* 1. *de Amiss: Grat. c.* 14.

My fourth Argument shall be taken from *Christ his rejecting of this Pharisaical depravation* of the Law of God, that some *commands* of the Law, and *some Sins* against those commands are so *small* and slight that God will not require a perfect fulfilling of the Law, as to lesser and smaller commands, nor the necessary avoiding of such Sins as are against those smaller commands. The words of Christ are these, *Mat.* 5. 18. *Till Heaven and Earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the Law, till all be fulfill'd.* The Lord *Christ* by these words, wherein he shews 'tis impossible that any thing in the Law, though accounted never so *small*, should pass from it, but all must be fulfill'd with a perfect Satisfaction, opposeth the *Pharisees*; who taking it for granted, that there was necessarily required to righteousness and life, a *perfect* fulfilling of the Law, and yet finding that it was *impossible* to keep the *minutissima legis*, as to abstain from all sinful inward motions in the mind and heart, from every idle word, *&c.* to have such a perfect conformity to the Law, that there should be no lusting contrary to it, coyned this distinction, that some of the commands of the Law were *small*, and some *great*; and though none could in those little commands against sinful motions of the heart, perfectly satisfie the Law, yet if he kept the *great*

4. *Arg.*

Commandments of the Law, concerning *outward acts* and *works* of the Law, he ſhould be juſt before God; ſince thoſe Commands of *little things* were but little Commands, and therefore would not condemn a man for tranſgreſſing of them, provided that he perform'd the *external* works commanded in thoſe *great Commands*. Now *Chriſt* vehemently *denies that there are any commands of the Law ſo ſmall and minute, as that God would not much regard them, or of which in the ſtabliſhing the righteouſneſs of the Law before God, a man ſhould give no account for the breaking of them, but God would account him righteous whether he obſerved them or no.* And therefore to ſhew the neceſſity of fulfilling the Law in the moſt *perfect and exact* manner, Chriſt aſſures, there ſhould not paſs from the Law one jot or tittle thereof that ſhould not be fulfil'd; not *a jot, the leaſt letter*, not a *tittle, the leaſt point*, but was ſo highly accounted of by God, that before they ſhould paſs away without being fulfil'd, *Heaven and Earth ſhould paſs away*. So that there was required to the fulfilling of the Law, that all things in it, even to the *leaſt apex* or *tittle*, ſhould be fulfill'd. To which Doctrine of Chriſt agrees that of *Moſes* and *Paul*, *Gal.*3.10. who denounced a *Curſe* not only againſt thoſe who continued not in the *great things*, but in *all things written in the Law*: And of *James* 2.10. who ſaith, *Whoſoever ſhall keep the whole Law, and yet offend in one, ſhall be guilty of all*; and this *one* is here to be taken for *any* one. As *Luk.* 15. 2. *If he have an hundred ſheep and loſe one*, that is, *any* one. So *Mat.* 10.42. *Whoſoever ſhall give a cup of cold water to one*, that is, to *any* one of the leaſt Believers, *&c.* So that *unum, one*, is equivalent to *quodlibet*, as here, *one jot or tittle* of the Law, that is, *any one* jot or tittle of the Law *ſhall not paſs away, but muſt be fulfil'd.*

Chriſtus fortiſſimè negat eſſe quædam mandata in lege ita minuta, quæ Deus non multum curat, quorum etiam quamvis non impleantur, non ſit habenda ratio in ſtatuendâ juſtitiâ legis coram Deo. Ut itaq; perfectiſſimam legis impletionem, neceſſariam eſſe Chriſtus oſtendat, ne unum quidem literæ apicem cadere pronuntiat, quod non ſit neceſſe impleri. *Chemnit. c.*51. *Harm. p.*337. *mihi.* Cujus præſtantiſſima Commentaria in hunc locum opto ut inſpiciant lectores & perlegant.

5. *Arg.* My fifth Argument is taken from that *macula*, or *ſtain*, or *filth*, that every Sin, even the *leaſt* and *lighteſt*, leaves behind it. This *ſtain* left behind the commiſſion of every Sin, is by ſeveral conſidered ſeveral ways: Either as an *habitual averſion* from God; or as an habitual diſconformity to the Law of God; or as the *impairing of inherent Grace*, (the beauty of the Soul), and the weakning of its acts; or as a greater habitude and inclination to Sin; In regard of ſome, or all of theſe left upon the Soul after the commiſſion of any Sin, 'tis ſaid, *that Sin defiles and pollutes*, Mat. 15. 11, 18. *Rev.* 22. 11. and that every Sin is a ſpot, *Epheſ.* 5. 27. and filthineſs, 2 *Cor.* 7. 1. *Jam.* 1. 12. *Ezek.*24.13. *Ezek.* 36.25. and when a man repents of Sin, and hath Sin pardoned to him, he is ſaid to be waſht and cleanſed, 1 *Cor.* 6. 11. 2 *Cor.*7.1. *Ezek.* 36.25, 33. And becauſe we are ſaid to be *cleanſed*, 1 *Joh.* 1.7. *from all Sin*, therefore *all* Sins, even ſuch as Papiſts call *Venial*, leave a ſpot and ſtain upon the Sinner, even as *Vaſquez* the Jeſuit confeſſeth. Now ſince there's this ſtain and defilement befals us after *every Sin*, there follows an

Negari non poteſt hominem vere manere pollutum ex peccato veniali, quod ſemel commiſit, donec ab eo juſtificetur; nam qui à peccato veniali juſtificatur, vere dicitur ab eo emundari. *Vaſquez in* 1a. 2dæ. *Diſp.*139. *c.*4.

an *exclusion for all Sin, from the Kingdom of Heaven, into which no unclean thing shall enter*, Rev. 21. 27. and that Exclusion *Bellarmine* tells us, is proper to Mortal Sins; and indeed that which excludes from Heaven, must needs deserve eternal death, and so be Mortal. And that this Exclusion is not to all, *perpetual*, 'tis not from the nature of *Sin*, nor from the cleansing virtue of any *Purgatory-fire*, but meerly of God in Christ pardoning and purifying. Lib. 1. de amiss. Grat. cap. 5.

My sixth Argument is taken from the *Power of God*, justly to *forbid* the least Sin under the *pain of an eternal penalty*. Now if God can justly *prohibit* the least Sins, under an *eternal penalty*, then may he justly punish those *Sins prohibited*, with that *eternal* penalty. And that God may *prohibit* the least Sin under an eternal penalty, is evident, not only because the Will of God forbidding any Sin under an eternal penalty, is a sufficent reason of that penalty, and makes the punishment proportionable to the demerit of the Sin; but because God hath *actually* prohibited under pain of eternal punishment, things in themselves *lawful and indifferent*, as abstinence from several kinds of Meats, Blood, *&c.* and therefore surely he may forbid all Sin under that penalty: Yea God in the *Covenant of Works* made with *Adam*, actually prohibited *all Sin* under the penalty of *eternal death*: Which is evident, because if God *promis'd eternal life* to *Adam*, upon *condition* of *perfect* Obedience, certainly the commission of the *least Sin* would have made *Adam* liable to eternal death; for he that performs not the condition prescrib'd in the Covenant, cannot obtain the reward, but contrarily deserves the punishment appointed against those who violate the Covenant; But if *Adam* had committed the least Sin, he had not performed the condition prescrib'd in the Covenant, which was perfect Obedience; therefore he had deserved the penalty appointed against the violators of the Covenant. And if the Covenant of Works bound not *Adam* to avoid *every Sin* for the escaping of eternal death, then it bound him (as the Covenant of Grace binds us) to repent of Sin for the escaping of eternal death, there being no remission of any Sin, or avoiding of eternal punishment for it without repentance: But under the Covenant of Works there was no Obligation to *repentance* for Sin; for if there had been any Obligation to *repentance* for Sin, there must have been a promise of *pardon* upon *repentance*; but that's false, because the promise of pardon belongs only to the Covenant of Grace, pardon being only bestow'd through Christ. 6. *Arg.*

Seventhly, I argue from the *Typical remission of Sins in the Old Testament*; for they were then commanded to offer Sacrifices, not only for *greater* and more enormous offences, but for their *lesser Sins*, as those of *infirmity* and *ignorance*, which the *Papists* call and account *Venial*. As is evident from *Levit.* 4. 2, 12, 13, *&c.* and *Lev.* 5. 17. Now those Sacri- 7. *Arg.*

Synopſ. pur. Theol. de pec. act. pag. mihi 176.

fices reſpected that *only* Sacrifice of *Chriſt*, by which *all* our Sins are expiated, as Chriſt was *made a curſe for us that he might deliver us from the curſe*, Gal. 3. 13. And from this (ſaith the learned *Walæus*), *Invictè demonſtratur*, 'tis invincibly demonſtrated, That every Sin of it ſelf is *Mortal.*

8. *Arg.* Eightly, I argue from the *infinity of evil* that is in every Sin, to its deſert of an *infinite puniſhment.* That every Sin is an infinite evil, is moſt certain; I mean not that 'tis infinite *intenſivè*, as to it ſelf or bulk, (as I may ſay) for as the Sinner is but finite, ſo Sin is a privation but of a *finite rectitude*; and if every Sin were infinite in its *intenſiveneſs*, all Sins would be equal. But yet two ways Sin is infinite: 1. *Objectivè*, becauſe committed againſt an infinite Majeſty. 2. *Extenſivè*, and in reſpect of its *duration*, becauſe its *ſtain* and defilement laſt *for ever*, in regard of the Sinner, who *cannot* of himſelf *repent.* In like manner there's an infinite *puniſhment* due to Sin, (I mean not a puniſhment infinite *intenſivè*; for a *finite* Creature cannot be capable of an *infinite* torture; but yet an infinite *puniſhment* is due to Sin) two ways, as *Sin* was ſaid to be two ways infinite: 1. A puniſhment is due to Sin, infinite *Objectivè*, by the Sinners being deprived of that *infinite good*, againſt whom he hath here offended, and whom he hath here neglected and deſpiſed. 2. A puniſhment infinite *extenſivè*, in reſpect of its *duration for ever*, becauſe the *ſtain* contracted from Sin commited in this life, endures for ever; and therefore the wicked who continue for ever *ſædi*, filthy and unclean, continue for ever *Dei Conſortio indigni*, unworthy of ever having Communion with God: *Qui nunquam deſinit eſſe malus, nunquam deſinit eſſe miſer*; he that never ceaſeth to be evil, never ceaſeth to be miſerable. The moſt *Venial* fault therefore, being *an infinite fault*, deſerves an *infinite* puniſhment. That 'tis an infinite fault, 'tis plain, becauſe 'tis againſt the infinite Majeſty of the Law-giver, and becauſe its ſtain of it ſelf, and without the mercy of God, endures for ever.

9. *Arg.* Ninthly, That *all Sins*, even ſuch as Papiſts call *Venial Sins*, *deſerve* an eternal puniſhment is evident, becauſe the *leaſt Sins* of Reprobates, *idle words, ſhall be puniſht* with eternal puniſhment. That thoſe leaſt Sins ſhall be puniſht *eternally*, is plain from *Mat.* 12. 36, 37. *Every idle word that men ſhall ſpeak, they ſhall give account thereof in the day of judgment; for by thy words thou ſhalt be juſtified, and by thy words thou ſhalt be condemned.* This *condemnation* here mention'd by *Chriſt*, plainly imports an *eternal puniſhment*; for in the day of Judgment there will be no condemnation to a *temporal* puniſhment. And that therefore the *leaſt Sins deſerve* eternal puniſhment is evident, becauſe otherwiſe the puniſhment which ſhall be inflicted for theſe Sins, would not be juſt, and proportionable to their demerit.

Nor can the *Papiſts* ſhun the force of this Argument, by ſaying, That 'tis

'tis meerly by *accident* that *Venial Sins* are puniſht with *eternal death*, not in regard of *themſelves*, but becauſe of the *condition of the ſubject* of theſe *Venial Sins*; which Sins by accident in Reprobates cannot be repented of, becauſe they are joined with *Mortal Sins* that exclude Grace neceſſary to repentance: This pittiful ſhift (I ſay) will not at all help the Papiſts; for theſe ſmaller Sins (which they call *Venial*) are of and by *themſelves* the cauſe of *condemnation* to an *eternal puniſhment*, as is evident from this place, *Mat.* 12. 36, 37. where *Chriſt* proves that an *account* ſhall be given *of every idle word*, becauſe by our *words we ſhall be condemned*; by which expreſſion he manifeſtly ſhews, that thoſe *idle words* of which he ſpake, though *Papiſts* count them *Venial*, are yet of *themſelves* a *ſufficient* cauſe of *condemnation* to *eternal puniſhment*; and beſides, if it be *unjuſt* (as *Bellarmine* blaſphemouſly ſpeaks) to *puniſh Venial Sins with eternal death*, becauſe they *deſerve* it not; and if a Venial Sin by its conjunction with a Mortal Sin in a Reprobate, is not made greater or deſerving of a greater puniſhment, but retains the *ſame nature* that it had before, it will then unavoidably follow, (if *of it ſelf* and in its *own nature* it deſerves not eternal puniſhment, that as 'tis in a *reprobate* joined with a Mortal Sin), it cannot *deſerve* eternal puniſhment, and by conſequence, it is not *puniſht* with an eternal puniſhment; for if it were, God ſhould puniſh Sins beyond their deſert. Nor can the Papiſts come off (as *Baronius* well obſerves) by ſaying, Though a *Venial Sin by a conjunction with Mortal Sin*, is not made more *grievous* and *hainous*, yet it is more *durable* by that conjunction; as having thereby an *eternal duration* of that *ſtain*, which follows it, becauſe without repentance, which by a Mortal Sin is hindred, there's no taking away of that ſtain. This ſubterfuge (I ſay) is very inſufficient; for the faults in Reprobates, which Papiſts call *Venial*, either *in themſelves* do, or do *not deſerve* eternal death; if they *do not* deſerve eternal death, then they are puniſhed *beyond* their deſert, (which is blaſphemy to ſay), If they *do deſerve* eternal death, then that deſert of eternal death is founded in the hainouſneſs of *the faults themſelves*; and eternal death is inflicted, not alone for the *duration* of the *ſtain* of thoſe Sins, but for the demerit of the offences *themſelves*; to which the Scripture expreſly agrees, which teſtifies, that eternal puniſhment in the day of Judgment, ſhall be inflicted for thoſe things *done in the body*, 2 *Cor.* 5. 10. ſo *Mat.* 25. 42, 43. And hence 'twas that *Scotus*, *Biel*, *Vega*, and *Medina*, becauſe they ſaw that if *Venial Sins* were puniſht *eternally*, they ſhould be ſo puniſht becauſe of what they were in *themſelves*, and in their own nature, and by the demerit of the offence, labour to put off all, by aſſerting, that the puniſhment wherewith the *Damned in Hell* are puniſht for *Venial Sins*, is not *eternal*, but *temporal*, and that it ſhall at length have *an end*, though their puniſhment inflicted on them for *Mortal Sins* ſhall laſt for *ever*: But others of their own Fraternity, condemn this juſtly for an *abſurd* opinion, particularly their great

Scot. in 4. ſent. diſtinct. 21. qu. 1.

Si vera sit sententia *Scoti*, sequitur posse nos orare pro iis qui sunt in inferno, ut citius solvantur à pœnâ debitâ pro his peccatis; siquidem illa tandem, postquam satis passum sit, à Deo dimittenda est. *Vasq. in* 1a. 2dæ. *Disp.* 141. *c.* 2.

great *Vasquez* the Jesuit, thus confuting it: *If* (saith he) *the opinion of* Scotus *be true*, viz. *That the Venial Sins of Reprobates shall not be punisht in Hell eternally; It will follow, That we may pray for those in Hell, that they may be freed from the punishment due to their Venial Sins, if that punishment after they have suffered long enough, be by God to be taken off.*

10. *Arg.*

Lastly, I argue from the *ridiculous absurdity* of the Doctrine of *Veniality of Sin*, to the *erroneousness of it.* The way, say the *Papists*, how *Sins Venial* come to be expiated and removed, is either in this life, or in the next: *In this life by, Sprinkling with holy Water, Confession to a Priest, beating the Breast, Whipping; saying the Lords-Prayer, Crossing, eating no Flesh, giving to the Church, &c.* In the *next life* Venial Sins are only expiated by the most torturing flames of *Purgatory*, greater than any tortures here in this life, yea as tormenting as Hell-fire, setting aside its duration (as the Papists say) and oft to be endured many hundreds of years. I demand then, If in this life a Venial Sin may be expiated with a *toy*, as sprinkling with holy Water, and Crossing, or the doing that which oft is, and always should be done with *cheerfulness*, as giving Alms, and yet in the next world it requires so many years of torturing flames to expiate it; what is the *reason of this difference* of the ways of expiating *Venial Sin*, that *here* it may be done with a *sport*, and *there* it requires such long and *inexpressible tortures* in fire a thousand times hotter than any here in this world, and as grievous as the torments of Hell? To this question the Papists answer, The *Sinner* is in the fault, who did not by so light and easie a way, expiate his Sin while here he lived; here he neglected his duty, and therefore there he smarts for it. But then I demand again, was that neglect of doing his duty in *this* world a *Mortal* Sin, or was it a *Venial* Sin? If a *Mortal* or damnable Sin, it should have carry'd the offender to *Hell*; If a *Venial* Sin, the difficulty again returns, Why may it not be expiated as ealily as other *Venial* Sins are?

Confiteor, tundo, conspergor, Conteror, oro; Signor, edo, dono, per hæc Venialia pono.

At ego rursus quæro; istud peccatum sitne Mortale, an Veniale? Si Mortale, in Purgatorium non venit; si Veniale, cur non eodem jure censetur quo reliqua Venialia? *Sadeel* de vera peccat. remis. *p. mihi* 609.

Non refert an uno quis excludatur peccato à beatitudine, an à pluribus, cum omnia similiter excludant. *Hieron.* in 5. at *Galat.* Πασα ἁμαρτία θανατὸς ἐστι ψυχῆς. Nazianz. in Orat. Funeb. in Mort. patris. Peccata parva si contra nos collecta fuerint, ita nos oppriment, sicut unum aliquod grande peccatum. Quid interest ad naufragium, utrum uno grandi fluctu navis obruatur, an paulatim subrepens aqua, navem submergat. *Aug. Ep.* 108.

Having now produced what I judg'd sufficient for *Confirmation* of this Truth against the *Veniality of Sin*, I could add many Allegations out of the *Fathers*, which abundantly testifie their consent with Protestants, in this point. As out of *Jerome* who hath these words *in quintum at Galat. It matters not whether a man be excluded from blessedness by one Sin, or by more, since all alike exclude.* Out of *Nazianzen, Every Sin is the death of the Soul.* Out of *Augustine* especially, besides what I have formerly mentioned

tioned in this Discourse, who *Epist.* 108. saith, *Our little Sins, if gathered together against us, will press us down as much as one great Sin. What difference is there between a Shipwrack caused by one great Wave, and by the Water that sinks the Ship, which comes into it by little and little.* The same Father, *Tract.* 12. in *Joh.* speaks thus, *Little Sins neglected, destroy as well as great ones.* But to avoid needless prolixity, I shall but very briefly dispatch this whole Discourse, with but naming the Heads of those many Inferences from it, which have taken me up much time elsewhere. And these Inferences might be,

Minuta peccata si negliguntur, occidunt. *Tract.* 12. in *Joh.*

1. Speculative and Controversal.
2. Practical.

3d. General, Application.

First, For Controversal Inferences.

I. If *every* Sin, even *Venial*, be damnable, *as breaking the Law* (as hath been proved) and none can live without them (as Papists confess) 'tis clear then, that now *none can in this life perfectly keep the* Law. 1.

Secondly, If no Sins be *Venial*, but all *mortiferous* and damnable, and make us guilty of Eternal Death, then down falls *merit ex condigno*, Merit by the worthiness of any works; for *to be guilty of death, and to deserve eternal Life, cannot stand together.* 2.

Thirdly, *Purgatory is but a Fable*, if no Sins be Venial; Why should that Fire *burn*, if it be not *purgative*? or rather, how can it *burn*, if it have no *Fewel*? 3.

II. The Practical Inferences, which are many, I shall but name.

First, If every Sin be damnable and mortiferous; then *Sin is of a very hainous* Nature. There's more malignity in an idle Word, and Injustice against God in a *vain thought*, than that all the World can expiate, more weight in it, than all the strength of Angels are able to bear. 1.

Secondly, If the *least* Sins are mortiferous, *What then are the greatest?* If a Grain presseth to Hell; If an Atom can weigh down like a Mountain; What then can a Mountain do? If *whispering* Sins speak so loud; What then do *crying* ones, Bloody Oaths, Adultery, Murder, Oppression? 2.

Thirdly, If every *single* Sin be damnable, *What then are all our Sins?* Millions of Sins, Sins of all our Ages, Conditions, Places that ever we lived in, Relations? If all were (as Saint *Austin* speaks) *Contra nos Collecta*, gathered into one heap against us, what an *heaven-reaching mountain* would they make? 3.

Fourthly, If every Sin be damnable and mortiferous, *God is to be justified in the greatest temporal severities which he* inflicts upon us. As God never punisheth so severely here, but *he can punish more*; so he never here punisheth so severely, but we *deserve* more and greater severities. Pains, Flames, Sword, Pestilences, those *tonsuræ insolescentis generis humani*, 4.

mani, those *mowings* down of so many Millions, are all short of damnation, deserved by Sin. God is to be justified in sending such Judgments, as the Fire of *London*, and the Tempest lately in *Utrecht*.

5. Fifthly, *They who instigate others to Sin are damnable* and mortiferous *Enemies to* Souls. They draw to an Eternal Punishment. Soul-Murder is the greatest, and Soul-Murderers most resemble the Devil in *carriage*, and shall in *condemnation*. How deeply dyed are those Sins and Sinners that are dipt in the Blood of Souls!

6. Sixthly, *'Tis no Cowardise to fear Sin.* Of *all fear*, that of Sin is most *justifiable*. 'Tis not *magnanimity* but *madness*, not valour, but fool-hardiness, to be *bold to Sin*. Surely, the boldness of Sinners, since Sin deserves Eternal Death, is not from want of *danger*, but *discerning*.

7. Seventhly, How *excusable are Ministers* and all Christian *Monitors, that warn against Sin.* They bid you take heed of *damnation*. To warn against which with the *greatest*, is the *mercifullest severity*.

8. Eighthly, How *madly sinful is it to be merry in Sin*! to make a *mock of it*! What's this but to *sport* with *Poyson*, and to *recreate* our selves with *damnation?* If here men are counted to *play* before us, when they are sinning, *'twill be bitterness in the* end. There's no Folly so great as to be pleased with the Sport that Fools make us, nor are any Fools like those that dance to damnation.

9. Ninthly, *Unconceivably great is the patience of God toward Sinners*, especially *great ones*: Gods patience discovers it self eminently, in that he spares *damnable* Sins, though he *sees* them, *hates* them infinitely more than we can do, is *able* to punish them every moment, is infinitely the Sinners *Superior*, yea seeks to *prevent* their punishment by warning, intreaties, threats, counsels; yea, puts forth daily Acts of *mercy* and bounty towards those who sin damnably; yea, he waits, and is long-suffering oft scores, and hundreds of years, though this waiting shews (not that he will *always spare*, but) that we should *now repent*.

10. Tenthly, *'Tis our Interest to be holy betimes*; 'tis good, that as much as may be of that which is so *damnable*, should be prevented. Shouldst thou be converted *in old age*, 'twill be thy extream sorrow that it was so *late*, though thy happiness it was *at all*. *Early repentance makes an easie Death-bed*, and makes joyful the last Stage of our journey unto Eternal Joyes.

11. Eleventhly, No *smalness of sin should occasion boldness to commit it*. 1. In some Cases, the *smalness* of the *inducement* to Sin, the slightness of the matter of thy Sin, *aggravates* the offence. To deny a Friend *a Cup of Water*, is a greater unkindness than to deny him a thousand pounds: What, wilt thou stand with *God* for a *trifle*, and damn thy Soul for a *toy?* wilt thou prefer a *peny* before God and Glory? 2. *Small Sins* are more *difficultly shunned*; A small bone of a Fish easily gets into the Throat, and 'tis hard to avoid it: And 3. *Small Sins dispose to greater*; the Wimble makes way for the Auger. 4. *Sins many*, though *small*,

1. Parvitas materiæ aggravat.
2. Parva difficilius cavent-tur.
3. Parva viam muniunt ad majora.
4. Minuta & multa sunt ut unum grande.

small, are as *one great one*; An heap of Sands presseth to death as well as a Sow of Lead; A Ship may sink *by Water* coming in at *a Leak*, drop by drop, as well as when overwhelmed with *a great Wave*. As *Austin* speaks.

Twelfthly, I note, The great reason why *Christ should* be dear to us. 12. Thou canst not be *without him*, no not for thy *little*, *thy least* Sins, and those of *dayly incursion*. Oh! that this Doctrine might make you and me prize Christ more, as long as we live. Because the Best cannot live without *small* Sins, neither can they live without a *great Saviour*; none of us can live without these smaller Sins, (as the very Papists grant) but oh that we may take a wiser course to get pardon of them, than they do, by our looking upon Gods *pity* through Christs Blood, as our only *Purgatory*. The *Pharisees* (of old) saw that we could not live without breaking the Law in smaller things (as we have shewn before) but let us more study than they did, Gods *design* in giving a Law which faln-Man is not able to keep. The Apostle tells us Gods design herein; *He aimed at Christ*, Rom. 10. 4. who was *intended* by God as his end in giving such a Law which faln-Man could not keep; namely, that Sinners might seek after his Righteousness, by seeing their own inability to keep it. How much do we want *Christ* at *every turn*, for our smallest inadvertencies, impertinent, wandring thoughts, in the adjacent defects and defilements of our holy things! Lord, I want thy Blood, as often as I fetch my breath!

Lastly, I infer the *happiness* of *Believers* under the *Covenant of Grace*. *Ult.* *Ex rigore Legis*, the least Sins damn, and none of us but every *day* and in every *duty*, commit them; but here's the Comfort, we are delivered through Christ, from that damnation which we deserve for all those unavoidable defects and evils, that attend the *Best in* their *best* observing the Law of God; we being loosed under the Covenant of Grace, from that *rigid exaction* of the Law, which suffers no Sin to go without Eternal punishment, and *delivered by Christ from the necessity of a perfect and exact fulfilling the Law of God, under pain of damnation*. 'Tis true, the Law still commands, even Believers, *perfect obedience*, and 'tis a Sin in Believers under the Covenant of Grace, that they do not obey the Law of God to the utmost perfection thereof; but here's our happiness, that Christ hath obtained, that the *imperfection* of our Obedience shall not *damn* us, but that our imperfect Obedience to the Law, shall through him be accepted. If indeed there were only the *Law and no Christ*, no Obedience but that which is *absolutely perfect*, could be entertained by God; but now, though *by the Law*, perfect Obedience be *required*, yet *by Grace*, imperfect (if sincere) Obedience is accepted; For *under the Covenant of Grace, strictly and precisely under pain of damnation, we are only obliged to that measure of obedience which is possible by the help of Grace*; and hence it is, that Christs Yoke is called *easie*, which cannot be understood Mat. 11. ult. of the Law in its *rigor*, but as *mitigated* by the Covenant of Grace:

That Yoke would not be *easie* but *intolerable*, if it propounded no hope of Salvation, but under that *impossible condition of* perfect Obedience to the Law. And 1 *Joh.* 5. 3. *His commands are not grievous*; but so they would be, if their exactions were rigorous in requiring perfect Obedience *under pain of damnation*, of us that cannot perform it: But for ever blessed be God, that though our best Obedience be *imperfect*, yet the *perfect* Obedience of Christ imputed to us, supplies the *defect* of ours; yea, that our imperfect Obedience doth not only not damn us (though the imperfection thereof *deserves* damnation according to the rigor of the Law) but that it is ordained to be the *way* to our Salvation; I mean *not its imperfection*, but it, *notwithstanding* its imperfection. Reader, if thou art a Believer, till thy Love to Jesus Christ, prompts thee to a more sutable Ejaculation, accept of this for a Conclusion of this whole Discourse. *A saving Eternity, (Father of Mercy) will be short enough to praise thee for Him, who hath delivered us from those many millions of Sins, the least whereof deserve a damning Eternity: Dear Lord Jesus, who hast saved us from the least Sin that ever we had or did, help us to serve thee with the greatest Love, that our Souls can either admit or express. And as (through Grace) the guilt of the least Sin shall not lye upon us; so neither let the Love of the least Sin lodg within us. Thou who hast made our Justification perfect, dayly perfect what our Sanctification wants. And never (Lord) let us put limits to our thankful returns, for those satisfying sufferings of thine, that knew no Bounds, no Measure.*

SERMON

SERMON IX.

Publick Prayer ſhould be in a Known Tongue.

Mr Nathaniel Vincent

1 COR 14. 15.

I will Pray with the Spirit, and will Pray with Underſtanding alſo.

THe Spirit of God foreſeeing, That in the latter dayes there would be an Apoſtacy and departure from the Faith; and that impious and corrupt Doctrines, would be publiſhed by Men of corrupt minds; hath ſo compiled the holy Scriptures, that from thence even thoſe Errors which aroſe long after the times of the Apoſtles may be detected and confuted. With very good reaſon, did *Tertullian* ſay, *Adoro Scripturæ plenitudinem, I adore the fulneſs of the Scripture* The Perfection and Sufficiency of it muſt needs be granted by all that underſtand it, and that will believe the Teſtimony, which it gives concerning it ſelf. 'Tis profitable πρὸς διδασκαλίαν, πρὸς ἔλεγχον, *for Doctrine and reproof.* It ſerves to inform and open the Eyes of the Ignorant, it ſerves to ſtop the Mouths of Gain-ſayers. Hence we may be furniſhed with both Offenſive and Defenſive Weapons: and the Armour which is fetched from it, is ſtiled τὰ ὅπλα τοῦ φωτός; *The Armour* or the *Weapons of Light*, Rom. 13. 12. And truly Sin and Error being but diſcovered, that very diſcovery, will have a great influence unto the mortification of the one, and our preſervation from the contagion of the other.

Lib. adv. Hermogen. cap. 22.

I do not at all wonder that the Church of *Rome* ſhould take away the *Key of Knowledg.* Open but *that Door*; and that Command would more generally be obeyed, which you read *Rom.* 18. 4. *Come out of her my people, that ye be not partakers of her Sins, that ye receive not of her*

Plagues. The Popish leaders are very much against the Scriptures being known, because it makes so much against them, and speaks so plainly against their Doctrines; and they are jealous lest their own men upon serious reading and consideration might be brought to say, *Aut hoc non est Evangelium, aut nos non sumus Evangelici*; Either this is not the Gospel, or we are not Gospellers. Either this Word of God is not true, or if it be true, then Popery is a meer falshood.

That there is such a great disagreement between the Scripture and Popery, might easily be made manifest in all the Points of Controversie between the *Romish* Church and Ours; we having departed from them upon this very score, because they have *rejected the Word of God*; and left that *Faith which was once deliver'd to the Saints.*

But the Point now to be insisted on, is, *The Language or Tongue, in which Prayer that is publick ought to be made.*

How near a kin is Mystical *Babylon* unto *Babel* of old in the Land of *Shinar!* We read that there the aspiring *builders Language was confounded, and they did not understand one anothers speech*, Gen. 11. 7. and this Confusion stopt the building of that Tower which was designed to reach Heaven. In the Devotions of the *Romish* Church, the Priest speaks but the People understand not what is spoken, and this is an impediment unto the Peoples Edification; so that their Devotions reach not Heaven, but are only *a speaking into the air*, 1 *Cor.* 14. 9. and are as little regarded by God, as they are understood by themselves. The Protestant Churches, on the other side, are for Prayer in a known Tongue; and good warrant they have from the Apostle himself, who says, *I will pray with the understanding*; and that in *the Church he had rather speak five words*, i.e. a few words *with his understanding, that by his voice he might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue.*

The Text informs us of the Apostles practice; which he proposes, surely not that we should dislike it and refuse to follow him but for our imitation. Three things are here to be consider'd.

1. *What's meant by Prayer?* It must be understood *concerning publick* Prayer, or Prayer with others; for the Apostle in this Chapter where the Text lies is delivering a *Decency and Order*, which was to be observed in the Publick Assemblies; he supposes several persons to be present, that might answer *Amen* to the Supplications and Thanksgivings that were made. This Interpretation, as *Beza* observes, is most agreeable with the scope of the Apostle, and the drift of his Discourse.

Si de privatis precibus ageret, videri posset à suo proposito aberrare. *Beza* in locum.

2. *What's meant by the Spirit?* I will pray *in the Spirit*; that is, *by the gift of Prayer which the Spirit bestows.* This Exposition I find in *Chrysostome*, τῷ πνεύματι, τέλεστι τῷ χαρίσματι. Extraordinary abilities of Prophecying and Praying were given after Christs Ascension, and the Mission of the Holy Ghost; and the end of all was the Churches Increase and Edification. Here 'tis not amiss to add, That by comparing other places with this, we must grant, that praying in the Spirit, com-

Λογ. λε. in 1 Epist. ad Corinth.

pre-

prehends a great deal more than the *bare gift of utterance* in this duty, whether extraordinary in an unknown, or more ordinary in a known Language. To pray in the Holy Ghoſt, implys, and that chiefly, the having our infirmities helped by the Spirit of God; our Graces quickned; our affections and deſires raiſed unto that ſtrength and fervency; unto which the Lord for his Son our Advocates ſake has promiſed ſatisfaction.

3. *What is meant by Underſtanding?* This muſt not be referred to the *Underſtanding of the Apoſtle*; for 'tis difficult to ſuppoſe that *He* at any time did not underſtand what himſelf did ſpeak. But it relates *to the Underſtanding of others*; as *verſ.* 19. *I had rather ſpeak five words with my underſtanding, that by my voice I might teach others alſo.* To *teach with the Underſtanding*, in the Apoſtles ſenſe, is to accommodate what we ſay to the Underſtanding and Capacity of thoſe whom we teach. In like manner *to pray with the Underſtanding*; is to pray ſo, as that thoſe whom we pray with, may apprehend what we beg for at the throne of Grace, and for what we return thanks unto God, elſe how is it poſſible they ſhould be edified?

Upon the words thus opened I build this *Theſis* which I am to maintain: *That Publick Prayer is not to be made in an unknown tongue, but in ſuch a Language as is underſtood by the common People.* In Publick Prayer I include Confeſſions of Sin, Petitions for Grace and Mercy, Interceſſions for others, and giving of Thanks; which are uttered in the hearing of the Congregation: and I affirm, That all ſuch Publick Worſhip and Service is to be performed in ſuch a Tongue as the Congregation is acquainted with. Hearken to the Apoſtle, 1 *Cor.* 14. 16, 17. *Elſe when thou ſhalt bleſs with the Spirit, how ſhall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned, ſay Amen at thy giving of Thanks, ſeeing he underſtandeth not what thou ſayeſt? for thou verily giveſt Thanks well, but the other is not edified. Chryſoſtome* upon theſe words ſpeaks thus, ἰδιώτην τὸν λαϊκὸν λέγει. By the man unlearned the Apoſtle means the Lay-man; even he muſt underſtand the words that are ſpoken in Prayer, that thereby he may be edified.

In the handling of this *Theſis*;

Firſt, I ſhall give you *the judgment of the Church of Rome* in the matter.

Secondly, *Produce arguments to prove that Publick Prayer ought not to be made in an unknown Language.*

Thirdly, I ſhall make it manifeſt, *that Antiquity is utterly againſt the Papiſts in this buſineſs.*

Fourthly, *I ſhall anſwer the Objections of the* Romiſh *Doctors*; and ſhew the weakneſs of their Arguments, which they urge for their *Latin*, and by the People not underſtood, Service.

Fifthly, I ſhall *diſcover the Myſtery of iniquity* in this Papal Doctrine, which preaches up and encourages to an ignorant Devotion.

Sixthly

Sixthly, Conclude *with a Practical Application.*

In the firſt place I am to give you the judgment of the Church of *Rome*. And that they indeed hold that Publick Prayer may be made in a Language that the People underſtand not; appears two ways.

1. By *their general Practice.* Their Maſs-Book is in *Latin*, their Divine Service, and Offices, as they call them, are performed in the *Latin* Tongue. But this is certain, that the *Latin* Tongue is not now the Mother-Tongue of any Nation under Heaven. In former ages indeed 'twas ſpoken in *Italy*. But that Nation has been ſo often invaded and overrun by forreign enemies, eſpecially by the *Goths* and *Vandals*; that there has been a great alteration in their Language; the preſent *Italian* being vaſtly different from that Language which the *Romans* of old uſed. But though *Latin* be not underſtood by the common People, yet in *Italy* and *Spain*, and *Germany*, and *France*, and other places, where the Pope governs and is obeyed, the Publick Service is *Latin*; and to teach, *that the People ſhould underſtand what they pray for*, is declaim'd againſt as a piece of Hereſie.

2. 'Tis not only the Practice of that Church to have *Latin* Prayers, nor the opinion only of ſome private Doctors, nor the judgment of a Provincial or National Synod that thus it ought to be; but that very Council of *Trent*, which they (though without reaſon) call Holy and Oecumenical, or General, does determine, that Prayer need not be made in a Vulgar Language. The words of the Council are theſe, *Seſſio. 22. capit. 22.*

Etſi Miſſa magnam contineat populi fidelis eruditionem, non tamen expedire viſum eſt Patribus ut vulgari lingua paſſim celebraretur. Though the Maſs do contain a great deal of inſtruction for the faithful people, yet it did not ſeem expedient to theſe Fathers that it ſhould be every where celebrated in a vulgar tongue.

Indeed afterward they command that the Paſtors *exponant aliquid*, expound ſomething, but ſince *ſomething* is only mention'd, and not *what*, nor *how much*, and to be ſure *not all*; we may well ſay, *Hoc aliquid nihil eſt*; This ſomething is as good as nothing. Moreover the ninth Canon runs thus:

Siquis dixerit lingua tantum vulgari Miſſam celebrari debere, Anathema ſit. Whoſoever ſhall ſay that the Maſs ought to be celebrated only in a vulgar language, let him be accurſed. You ſee how a Popiſh Council determines that Publick Prayer need not be in a known Tongue, and thunders out an Anathema againſt thoſe who are otherwiſe minded.

In the ſecond place follow the Arguments againſt the Papiſts, which prove that Publick Prayer ought not to be made in a Language unknown to the People.

1. When Prayer is made in an unknown Tongue, the Name of God is taken in vain. *Aquinas* ſpeaks of four ways of taking Gods Name: 1. *Ad dicti confirmationem*, when we call God to witneſs the truth of what

what has been ſpoken. 2. *Ad Sanctificationem*, to the ſanctifying and ſeparating of a thing to an uſe that is holy; thus the water in Baptiſm is ſeparated to a Sacramental uſe, by the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt. 3. *Ad operis completionem*, unto the performing of any work which we undertake. Thus *David* went forth againſt *Goliah* in the Name of the Lord of Hoſts, whoſe Armies that proud Giant had defied. 4. *Ad confeſſionem & invocationem*, when we make confeſſion of Gods Name before others, or call upon his Name our ſelves.

Now when thus in Prayer we take the Name of God into our mouths we muſt remember the third Commandment, and how the Great Law-giver has expreſly ſignified, *that he will not hold the tranſgreſſors guiltleſs.* 'Tis the firſt Petition in the Lords-Prayer, *Hallowed be thy Name:* But how can thoſe that underſtand not the words of Prayer, hallow Gods Name? How can their hearts and their words go together? and if they don't, the Worſhip is vain. *Mat.* 15. 8, 9. *This people draweth nigh to me with their mouth, and honoureth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me; and in vain do they worſhip me.* The People in *Latin* Prayers underſtand not when Sin is confeſſed, nor when Pardon and Grace are asked, nor when praiſe is offered: How then can their hearts be ſuitably affected? It follows therefore that the Lords Name is taken, and an Ordinance uſed in vain. Certainly the end of Oral Prayer is not attained in the Church of *Rome*. The reaſon of uſing words in this duty is that others may underſtand, and join with us, and alſo that our own thoughts and hearts by the words may be kept more cloſe to God, and intent upon his ſervice; but in both theſe regards *Latin* Prayers to thoſe that underſtand not *Latin* are juſt as good as none at all.

2. Prayer in an unknown Tongue is ignorant Worſhip. The *Samaritans* were blamed by Chriſt *for worſhipping they knew not what*, Joh. 4. 22. And he ſpeaks by way of reprehenſion to his Diſciples, *Ye know not what ye aſk.* So that not only the Object of Prayer muſt be known, but likewiſe the matter which we pray for. But in both theſe regards the poor Papiſts are miſerably ignorant. Their Idolatry plainly ſhews they have not right conceptions of the Godhead. How like are they to the Heathen *Romans* of old, who before their Converſion to the Chriſtian Faith, *changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like unto corruptible man*, Rom. 1. 21. which is an evident Argument, *that they are become vain in their imaginations, and that their fooliſh hearts are darkned*, *ver.* 23. The Papiſts multiply Altars indeed, but upon all their Altars this Inſcription may be written, which was upon the Altar at *Athens*, Ἀγνώστῳ Θεῷ, They are dedicated to a *God they know not.*

And as they know not the God they pray to, ſo neither do they underſtand what they pray for. And what is ignorant Worſhip if this be not, *To make unknown Prayers to an unknown God?* Surely 'tis the will of God, we ſhould underſtand what we pray, but the Papiſts are willingly ignorant, and it abundantly ſuffices them, if ſo much time is but waſted

wasted in their Devotions, and so many words are but pronounced, though they understand those words no more than a Parrot does the meaning of those words of ours which it has learned to imitate.

3. How can such Prayers as are made in an unknown Tongue, be made in Faith? and yet Faith is so necessary an ingredient in Prayer, that the Apostle sticks not to say, *Let not that man*, who asks not in Faith, *think that he shall receive any thing of the Lord*, Jam. 1. 7. We must believe that what we ask is according to the Will of God; to this end the Word which is the declaration of Gods Will ought to abide in us. *Joh.* 15. 7. *If ye abide in me and my words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you.* There must also in Prayer be a relyance upon the Promises of God, all which are *Yea and Amen in Christ:* But how can we either believe that we ask according to the Will of God; or relie upon those Promises which God hath made, if we know not what we pray?

Faith in Prayer, which is true, always presupposes knowledg; *How shall they call on him* (says the Apostle) *in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard?* Rom. 10. 14. He that understands not the Tongue in which the Prayers are made, cannot certainly tell whether the Lord be praised or blasphemed; whether Grace be implored, or liberty beg'd to continue in wickedness: Nay he cannot tell whether God be prayed to at all. How then shall a man in Faith be able to join in such manner of Supplications? And as this unknown Tongue is an impediment to Faith, so when what is asked is not understood, How can the Desires be lively? *Ignoti nulla cupido*: The Understanding must apprehend the evil before that evil can be heartily deprecated; and be convinced of the good before the Will is brought to embrace it.

4. The design of Prayer, is not to work any change *in God* with whom there is not the least variableness, neither shadow of turning; but a change *in us*; that by Prayer we may be the better disposed for the reception of what we ask. But how can Prayer which is not understood be here available? When this Duty is rightly performed, it tends to the making of us more sensible of our guilt and vileness, our neediness and insufficiency; and to the setting of a greater edge upon our affections, towards those Spiritual and Eternal Blessings which are promised in the New Covenant; and by this means we are made more meet for the accomplishment of those Promises. But Prayer in an unknown Tongue leaves Men as it found them. And they must needs continue under their deadness, their hearts being straitned and *alienated from God through the blindness that is in them.*

5. Though to speak in an unknown Tongue was in the first age of the Christian Church a Miraculous Gift, and served much for the confirmation of the Christian Faith. Yet *unless there were an interpreter*, the use of an unknown Tongue was not permitted in the Publick Worship of God.

1 Cor.

1 *Cor.* 14. 28. *If there be no interpreter, let him keep silence in the Church, and let him speak to himself and to God.* Surely then it plainly follows, that Prayer with the Unlearned should not now be made in *Latin*, since skill in that Language is not now an extraordinary Gift, but gained by ordinary instruction and industry; and the use of it in Prayer with those that know not the meaning of it, tends not to confirm Christianity, but to hinder true Devotion.

6. The use of an unknown Tongue in the Lords Service is expresly denied to be unto Edification. The Apostle gives this general Rule, *Let all things be done to edifying*, 1 *Cor.* 14. 26. and *v.*17. he before expresly says, That the Unlearned *is not edified* by Worship in a Language which he does not understand, though the Prayers or Praises be never so excellent. The Papists indeed that are devout in their way, may possibly imagin they are edified by their *Latin* Prayers; but they would do well to consider, that the Apostle speaks very plainly, That *an unknown Tongue is not to Edification*; and it concerns them likewise to suspect their own hearts, which are so deceitful, and to fear lest Satan by delusory Affections, and a false Peace, impose upon them. But let us suppose that they are really affected at their Devotions; certainly no thanks at all to the Prayer, the meaning of which they are utterly ignorant of.

Well then, since Prayer is to be unto Edification, it must be such as may be understood by the People. The Spiritual benefit and advantage of their Souls is to be regarded in all Publick Administrations. The Apostles had indeed the gift of Tongues in the day of *Pentecost*; but, which is very much to be marked, *It was not that they might speak in an unknown, but in a known Language to the People.* Therefore you read, that those *Parthians and Medes, and Elamites*, and the rest of them did say, *We do hear every one in the Tongue wherein we were born, the wonderful works of God*, Act. 2. 8, 12.

I might farther add, That it is repugnant to the very nature of Publick Prayer, that it should be in an unknown Tongue. For the People all the while if they are *at any*, are at *their private Devotions*, though in the Publick Assembly; while the Priest in *Latin* is confessing Sin, the Peoples hearts may be giving thanks for Mercy; while the Priest is asking for one kind of Blessing, the Peoples Affections may be carried out after another. Thus there is not *that agreeing together* in what they ask, which Christ speaks of; and which is necessary in Publick Prayer.

7. The Apostle having delivered this Doctrine, that Prayer and Praise should be in a known Tongue, adds at the close of the Chapter; not only, That he taught the *same in all Churches of the Saints*; but also, *If any man think himself to be a Prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledg, that the things which I write unto you are the Commandments of the Lord*, 1 *Cor.* 14. 37. So much for the Arguments against Prayer in an unknown Tongue.

In the third place I am to manifest, That *Antiquity* is utterly against the Church of *Rome* in this matter: the Papists talk much of the Fathers indeed; but how disobedient they are to them, and how much they dissent from them, may most easily be evinced.

And because the Council of *Trent* hath Anathematized all that are against the Popish *Latin* Prayers, I will *suppose another Council*, and several of the most eminent, and ancient Fathers Members of it; and that I may deal the more fairly with our Adversaries, I will suppose some of their own most noted and famous Doctors admitted into this Council; and that yet it may be the more regarded, I shall suppose the Apostle *Paul* himself to be the President of it.

The Fathers whom I shall mention are *Justin Martyr*, *Origen*, *Cyprian*, *Ambrose*, *Augustine*, *Hierome*, *Basil*, and *Chrysostome*.

The Question to be debated, is, *Whether Prayer is to be made in a known, or in an unknown Tongue?* Let the Fathers speak in order.

Justin Martyr, who is very ancient, and lived about the year 160, *Apol.* 2. *ad Antoninum Pium, sub finem*, tells us:

Καὶ τῇ τοῦ ἡλίου λεγομένῃ ἡμέρᾳ πάντων κατὰ πόλεις ἢ ἀγρους μενόντων ἐπι το αὐτὸ συνέλευσις γίνεται, καὶ τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων ἢ τὰ συγγράμματα, ἄχρι ἐγχωρεῖ. Εἶτα παυσαμένου τοῦ ἀναγινώσκοντος, ὁ προεστὼς διὰ λόγου τὴν νουθεσίαν καὶ πρόκλησιν τῶν καλῶν τούτων μιμήσεως ποιεῖται; ἔπειτα ἀνιστάμεθα κοινῇ πάντες καὶ εὐχὰς πέμπομεν, καὶ παυσαμένων ἡμῶν τῆς εὐχῆς ἄρτος προσφέρεται καὶ οἶνος.—Καὶ προεστὼς εὐχὰς ὁμοίως καὶ εὐχαριστίας ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ ἀναπέμπει, καὶ ὁ λαὸς ἐυφημεῖ λέγων τὸ ἀμήν.

On the day commonly called Sunday, Assemblies are made of Citizens and Countrymen, and the writings of the Apostles and Prophets are read: The Reader giving over, the Minister makes an Exhortation to the People, perswading to the imitation and practice of those good things that are propounded. After this we rise all, and pour out Prayers, and Bread and Wine are brought forth, and the Minister to the uttermost of his ability, does send forth Prayers and Praises unto God, and the People give their consent, saying, Amen.

Behold the Scriptures read even to Citizens, nay to Country-People, and Prayers made which they did understand, and say Amen to.

Origen may speak next. *Lib.* 8. *Contra Celsum* pag. (*mihi*) 402. Οἱ μὲν τῶν χριστιανῶν οὐδὲ ἐν ταῖς θείαις γραφαῖς κειμένοις ὀνόμασι καὶ τεταγμένοις ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ χρῶνται ἐν ταῖς εὐχαῖς, ἀλλ' οἱ μὲν ἕλληνες ἑλληνικοῖς, οἱ δὲ ῥωμαῖοι ῥωμαϊκοῖς; καὶ ἕτερος ἕκαστος κατὰ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ διάλεκτον εὔχεται θεῷ καὶ ὑμνεῖ αὐτὸν ὡς δύναται; καὶ ὁ πάσης διαλέκτου κύριος τῶν ἀπὸ πάσης διαλέκτου εὐχομένων ἀκούει. *The Christians in their Prayers use not the very words* (he means the Words in the Original) *of the Scriptures; but they that are Greeks do use the Greek Tongue, and those that are Romans the Roman Tongue; and so every one according to his Dialect, does Pray unto God, and praise him according to his ability; and He that is the Lord of every Language, does hear the Prayers which are put up to Him in every Language.*

Cyprian *De Orat. Domin.* pag. (*mihi*) 309. speaks thus:

Aliter

Aliter Orare quam docuit Christus, non ignorantiæ sola est, sed & culpæ; quando ipse posuerit & dixerit, rejicitis mandatum Dei ut Traditionem vestram statuatis.

To Pray otherwise than Christ has taught, is not only ignorance, but a great fault; for he has expresly said, Ye rejected the Command of God, that ye may establish your own Tradition. Now where has Christ taught the use of an unknown Tongue in Prayer? 'tis but *Romes* Invention and Tradition, and that not of a very long standing.

Ambrose may be heard in the next place, in 1. *ad Corinth. c.* 14.

Si utique ad ædificandam Ecclesiam convenitis, ea debent dici quæ intelligant audientes: nam quid prodest ut quis linguâ loquatur quam solus scit, ut qui audit nihil proficiat?

If ye come together to edifie the Church, those things ought to be spoken that the hearers may understand; for what does he profit the People who speaks in an unknown Tongue to them? And afterwards the same Father adds; *There were some; of the* Hebrews *especially, that used the* Syriack, *and the* Hebrew *Tongue in their Services; but these aimed at their own glory and commendation, not at the Peoples benefit.* Though the *Hebrew* Tongue was that in which God of old utter'd the Law upon Mount *Sinai*, that which *Moses* and the Prophets used; though the *Syriack* was that in which our Lord himself spake while he was upon Earth; yet *Ambrose* blames those that prayed in these Languages with those People who did not understand them. After *Ambrose*, let us hear *Augustine*, *Enarrat. in Psalmum* 18.

Intelligere debemus, ut humanâ ratione non quasi avium voce cantemus; Merulæ, Psittaci, Corvi, Picæ, & hujusmodi volucres sæpe docentur ab hominibus sonare quæ nesciunt: scienter vero cantare non avi sed homini divinâ voluntate concessum est.

We ought to understand what we pray for, that we may not like Birds, but like men, sing unto God. For Black-birds and Parrots, and Crows, and Pies, and such kind of Fowls, are taught to sound forth what they understand not: But to sing (which certainly in the Psalms of *David* includes Prayer and Praising) *with understanding, is granted not to a Bird, but to a Man through the good pleasure of God.*

From this Fathers words you may perceive, that the not-understood Prayer of a Papist is likened unto the prating of a Pye, or Parrot.

Hierom, who was famous for his skill in Languages, and was himself a Presbyter of the Ancient Church in *Rome*, yet speaks after this manner, *Præfat. in Epist. ad Galatas.*

In Ecclesiis Urbis Romæ *quasi tonitrua Cœleste audimus Populum reboantem, Amen. In the Churches of the City of* Rome, *the Voice of the People was like Heavenly Thunder, when they answered aloud, Amen*, at the end of the Prayers which they put up unto God.

The People understood, and gave their consent unto the Prayers which were used in those days; but the present Church of *Rome*, *Heu*

quantum mutatur ab illâ! Alas, how much is it altered from what it once was!

Again the ſame *Hierom* ſpeaks, *Sub finem Comment. in Epiſt. ad Galatas.*

Quod autem Amen conſenſum ſignificet audientis & ſit ſignaculum veritatis ad Corinthios *prima nos docet, in qua* Paulus *ait, Cæterum ſi benedixeris Spiritu, qui ſupplet locum idiotæ, quomodo dicet Amen ſuper tua benedictione, quoniam quidem neſcit quid dicas: ex quo oſtendit non poſſe idioten reſpondere verum eſſe quod dicitur, niſi intellexerit quod docetur.*

Amen ſignifies the conſent of the hearer, and is a ſealing of the Truth: Paul *ſays, If thou bleſs with the Spirit, how ſhall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned ſay Amen at thy giving of thanks, ſeeing he underſtandeth not what thou ſayeſt? whereby he declares, That the unlearned Man cannot anſwer, that that which is ſpoken is true, ſince he does not underſtand it.*

Great *Baſil*, his mind you may know concerning the propoſed Queſtion, *Homil. in Pſalmum* 28. Having complained before that the Children of Men do not in His Temple give glory unto God, he adds;

Ἡ γλῶσσα ψαλλέτω, ὁ δὲ νῦς ἐρευνάτω τὴν διάνοιαν τῶν εἰρημένων, ἵνα ψάλλῃς τῷ πνεύματι, ψάλλῃς δὲ καὶ τῷ νοΐ. *Let thy Tongue ſing, and let thy Mind ſearch the meaning of what is ſpoken, that according to the Apoſtle, thou mayeſt ſing with the Spirit, and ſing with underſtanding alſo.*

Chryſoſtom agrees with the forementioned Fathers fully, Λογ. λε *in* 1 *Epiſt. ad Corinth.*

Ἰδιώτην τὸν λαϊκὸν λέγει, καὶ δείκνυσι σὺν ὅσῃ μικρὰν ζημίαν ὑπομένουσα, ὅταν τὸ ἀμὴν εἰπεῖν μὴ δύνηται. *Take notice, ſays he, how the Apoſtle does always ſeek the Churches Edification. By the unlearned Man,* Paul *means the Layman, and ſhews how this unlearned Perſon does ſuſtain a very great loſs, when Prayers are made in ſuch a Language, as he through want of underſtanding is not able to ſay Amen to them.*

I ſhall add unto theſe paſſages of the Fathers, a Conſtitution of the Emperor *Juſtinian.* Emperors of old were reverenced by the Church, though now the Pope endeavours to Lord it over them. The Conſtitution is this. *Novel. Conſtit.* 123.

Jubemus, omnes Epiſcopos, &c. *We command that all Biſhops and Preſbyters do celebrate the Holy Oblation, and Prayers uſed in Holy Baptiſm, not ſpeaking low, but with a clear Voice which may be heard by the People, that thereby the Minds of the People may be ſtirred up with greater Devotion in uttering the Praiſes of the Lord God.* And for this is cited 1 *Cor.* 14. *How ſhall the Unlearned ſay Amen, if he does not underſtand what is ſpoken?* And then it follows, *If the Prieſts neglect theſe things, the Judgment of God and Chriſt will fall on them; neither will we,* ſays the Emperor, *when we know it, reſt and leave it unrevenged.*

But now let us hear the Romiſh Doctors themſelves ſpeaking to the Queſtion in Hand.

Cardinal

Cardinal *Cajetan*, *Comment. in* 1 *Epiſt. ad Corinth. c.* 14. has theſe words; *Ex hac* Pauli *Doctrina habetur, quod melius eſt ad edificationem Eccleſiæ, orationes publicas, quæ audiente Populo dicuntur, dici linguâ communi Clericis, & Populo, quam dici Latinè.*

From this Doctrine of the Apoſtle Paul *it follows, That it is better for the edification of the Church, that the publick Prayers which the People hear, ſhould be made in that Language which both the Prieſts and People underſtand, than that they ſhould be made in Latin.*

Here I cannot chuſe but cry out, *Magna eſt Veritas*, great is Truth, and it will prevail! Behold a Cardinal of the Romiſh Church, ſpeaks as plainly againſt the Council of *Trent*, as any whom they nickname Hereticks can.

The next Romiſh Author is *Nicolaus de Lira*, who gloſſing upon the ſame Chapter, ſpeaks to the ſame purpoſe.

Si Populus intelligat orationem ſive benedictionem Sacerdotis; melius reducitur in Deum & devotius reſpondet, Amen.

If the People underſtand the Prayer or Thanksgiving which is performed by the Prieſt, their minds will be brought the better and nearer unto God, and with greater devoutneſs they will anſwer, Amen.

The third Romiſh Doctor, ſhall be the Angelical (as he is called) and highly-magnified *Thomas Aquinas*, *Commentar. in* 1 *Epiſtolam ad Corinth. cap.* 14. His words are theſe;

Plus lucratur qui orat & intelligit; nam reficitur, & quantum ad intellectum, & quantum ad affectum.

He gains moſt who prays and underſtands the words which he ſpeaks; for he is edified both as to his underſtanding, and alſo as to his affections.

Again he ſaith, *Melius eſt ut lingua quæ benedicit, etiam interpretetur; omnis enim ſermo bonus eſt ad edificationem fidei.*

'Tis beſt that the Tongue which bleſſes, ſhould interpret; for good words ſhould be ſpoken to the edification of faith.

Here we may with reaſon ſay, *Bene quidem ſcripſiſti Thomâ.*

Thomas thou haſt written what is agreeable to Truth.

Thus the Fathers and the Popiſh Doctors themſelves have deliver'd their opinions, and all are for praying in a known Language.

Nay I have read, and 'tis acknowledged by a Jeſuit, *Azorius Inſt. lib.* 8. *cap.* 26. *ex Æn. Sylv.* That above ſix hundred years ago, when the Pope did deliberate and conſult whether he ſhould grant unto the *Bohemians* the uſe of the Vulgar Tongue in their publick Devotions; there was heard a voice from Heaven, ſaying, *Omnis lingua confiteatur ei*; *Let every tongue confeſs unto God.*

But now at laſt let us be determined by the Apoſtle *Paul*, the ſuppoſed Preſident of the Council, and his mind I ſhall give you in this Paraphraſe upon his own words.

I thank my God I ſpeak with Tongues more than you all; but I had rather ſpeak five words to be underſtood by, and to edifie thoſe that hear me, than

than ten thousand words in an unknown Tongue. If the Trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battel? and if I pray, and those that are present understand not the meaning of the voice, how shall they wrestle with God? how shall they defend themselves against the assaults of the Tempter? how shall they join in begging for Grace to overcome him? I am an Apostle, and not a Barbarian, and I would not speak words into the air, but so as to benefit them that hear me. I am unwilling the Publick Worship of God should be exposed to the contempt and scorn of Infidels; or that they should censure it to be only the raving of mad-men, because they know not the meaning of the words that are used. Our God is not the God of confusion, but requires a reasonable Service, and these commands concerning Prayer and Praising so as to be understood, are his commands. Every one who is indeed spiritual will be thus perswaded: they who are otherwise minded are willingly ignorant.

You see I have proved the Protestant Doctrine out of the Fathers; nay, 'tis granted by Popish Authors of very great name; and how plainly the Apostle is on our side, do but read and judg.

Let the Papists now for shame cease their bragging of Antiquity. 'Twas certainly the manner of the elder and purer times to pray in a known Language. Thus prayed the Apostles, thus prayed our Lord Jesus, thus praised the Heavenly Host at Christs Nativity, in such words as the very Shepherds understood, *Glory be to God in the Highest, on Earth peace, good-will towards men.* Thus the Prophets prayed, and *David* the sweet-Singer of *Israel*; all his Psalms were written in *Hebrew*, the *Jews* Mother-tongue. Thus sung *Deborah* and *Barak*, thus *Moses* and the *Israelites* after their Miraculous Deliverance out of *Egypt*, and *Pharaohs* overthrow in the mighty Waters. Nay I must add, there was a time when there was but one Language in the whole World; before the building of *Babel*, and then there was no unknown Tongue to pray in. In the days of *Enos* the Son of *Seth* the Grand-child of *Adam*, 'tis said, *Men began to call upon the Name of the Lord*, Gen. 4. 26. And this must of necessity have been done in a Language which none were ignorant of. Surely then the Protestant Religion in this regard must be acknowledged of sufficient Antiquity, since 'tis as old as the old World, since 'twas before the flood of *Noah*.

In the fourth place I shall answer the Popish Arguments to defend their Cause; and shall not fear to produce the very strongest which I have met withal.

1. 'Tis Objected, That the Apostle does not speak in 1 *Cor.* 14. concerning the ordinary Divine Service, but concerning Spiritual Songs, which by an extraordinary Gift were utter'd.

Ans. The Apostle does mention Prayer as well as giving of Thanks; and there is as much reason that the ordinary Service should be understood, as the extraordinary; because that which is ordinarily used, should by all means be to Edification.

2. 'Tis

2. 'Tis Objected, That Prayer in an unknown Tongue is not condemned, but Prayer in a known Tongue only preferred. *Bellar.* Lib. 2. de Verbo Dei, Capit. 16.

Answ. First, Suppose this, why does the Church of *Rome* pray after the worse, and not after the better manner of the two? *Secondly*, I say 'tis condemned by the Apostle as not being for Edification; for he that could speak in a Tongue, if he could not interpret, nor any Interpreter present, *was commanded to keep silence in the Assembly.*

3. 'Tis Objected, That of old the Instruction and Edification of the People was necessary, and the use of Prayer was, that they might be Instructed and Edified: But now the end of Prayer is not so much the Peoples Instruction and Edification, as the yielding to God that Worship which is due to him. Id. ibid.

Answ. First, The Apostles were as careful that God might have his Worship, as the Papists, nay a great deal more careful. Secondly, Disjoin not Gods Worship and the Peoples Edification; for he is best Worshipped *in spirit and in truth.* And the more the mind understands, and the heart of the Worshipper is affected, God is the more honoured, and the better pleased.

4. 'Tis Objected, That Prayer is not made to the People but unto God, and he understands all Tongues alike; and 'tis sufficient that the Lord understands what is prayed, though the People are ignorant. And this *Bellarmine* does illustrate by a similitude. If a Courtier, says he, should petition for a Country-man in *Latin* to a King, the Country-man might be benefited by the *Latin* Petition of the Courtier, though he should not understand a word of it. Loco citato.

Answ. 1. It might have been said, That God understands all Tongues alike in the Apostles days as well as now; the Lord being then and now, and always, equally Omniscient. 2. The use of Prayer is not to inform the God we pray to, *For he knows what things we have need of before we ask*, Mat. 6. 8. but to make our selves more sensible of our needs, and consequently more meet to be supplied; but how can this be if Prayer be lockt up in an unknown Dialect? 3. As for *Bellarmines* Similitude, it will not hold. For the God of Heaven is not like the Kings on Earth, who will hear Petitions made by Favourites for persons that make no address themselves: But He requires, That every particular person should ask if he will receive, and understand what he prays for; and that he should have suitable affections to the matter of his Petitions, if he will be heard and answered. Add also, That if a King should forbid Petitions in a strange Language, and should command that Petitioners should use a Tongue they understand, that with the greater earnestness they may beg what they need; to such an one a *Latin* Petition would not be so acceptable; But God has forbid the use of an unknown Tongue: Therefore we may conclude, That the Popish *Latin* Prayers in an Auditory which understand them not, are to very little purpose. The *People must seek and knock* as well as the Priest, else they

they shall not find, else it *will not be opened unto them*, Mat. 7. 7.

In the fifth place I am to discover the tendency of, and Mystery of Iniquity in this Papal Doctrine, which encourages to Prayer in an unknown Tongue, and teaches People to be contented with an ignorant Devotion.

1. It gratifies exceedingly the lazy dispositon of Men, who naturally like a liberty to rest *in opere operato*, in the work done, and cannot endure to be urged to the more difficult part of Religion, which lies in a conflict with wandring thoughts in duty; in watching over, and taking pains with the heart, that it may be intent, considerate and affectionate in its applications unto God. I know the Papists boast of their austerities in their Devotions; but these are external things, and who has required them at their hands? And I may with good reason affirm, That one quarter of an hour spent in Prayer, where the very heart is engaged, and understands what 'tis doing, and seeks the Lord with its whole desire, will be to better purpose than all the Prayers by rote that are, or can be said by a blind Papist, though he should live to the age of *Methuselah*.

2. This Doctrine is a notable device to keep the People ignorant, and to make them more dependent upon the Priesthood; and hereby they hope more easily to rule them. These cruel Guides, as they take away the Bible from the People, which is the great means of Knowledg; so they will not suffer them to cry for Knowledg, so as to know what they cry. What a faithful servant is the Pope unto the Prince of Darkness! and what quiet possession does the strong man armed keep while the Gospel is hid, and men pray for they know not what, and consequently obtain nothing!

3. Many Prayers may well be made in *Latin* meerly through shame. When I read the Scripture, I conclude the Papists are afraid of the Light which shines from thence, lest it overthrow their black Kingdom; and when I read the foolish, nay blasphemous Prayers, which are made in the Church of *Rome*, I conclude they are ashamed the meaning of them should be known. Thus they pray to the Virgin *Mary*.

Sancta Maria,	O Saint *Mary*,
Quæ totum orbem illuminas.	*Who dost enlighten the whole world.*
Quæ tuos servientes exaltas.	*Who dost exalt thy servants.*
Illuminatrix cordium.	*Who dost illuminate hearts.*
Fons misericordiæ.	*Who art the fountain of mercy.*
Ab omni malo libera nos Domina.	*From all evil good Lady deliver us.*

To Saint *Dorothy* they pray thus:

Sancta Dorothea,	*O holy* Dorothy,
Cor mundum in me crea.	*A clean heart create in me.*

Saint

Saint *Agnes* is prayed unto *to keep them in the Faith*; and Saint *George to save them from their Sins, that they may rest in Heaven with the Blessed for ever.* These *Latin* Prayers in plain *English* are most wicked Blasphemies; and both Gods work and honour, which is peculiar to himself, and dear to him, is (to the provoking of him to jealousie) ascribed and imparted to the Creature.

In the last place I come to the Application.

USE I.

Bless the Lord that the Day-spring from on high hath visited this Land of your Nativity, and that Popish darkness is so much dispelled. How thankful were the *Israelites*, think you, for that Light which shined so clear in *Goshen*, when *Egypt* was plagued with Darkness, that was so hideous and palpable? Neighbouring Regions, most of them are blinded by *Rome* and Hell; and see not the things which you see, hear not the things which you hear. You are instructed to whom Prayer is be directed, unto God; and in whose Name, in the Name of Christ, whose Mediation and Intercession is always prevalent. Supplications are made in a Tongue which you understand; that you may be the more affected with what you pray for, and consequently have gracious returns to your Prayers from the God of all Grace. What cause is here of Thanksgiving that Publick Administrations are so much more agreeable unto Christs Institution, than the Administrations of the Church of *Rome.*

Prayers being poured forth with so much fervency, and in such words as all, even the meanest, understand; the Scriptures being read in a Language which you know, so as that the Book of God is not a sealed Book to you; Sermons being preached with so much plainness and power. Finally, Sacraments being administred, so as that you may know how to improve these Seals of the New Covenant, to the strengthning of your Faith, the inflaming of your Love, and the increase of all manner of Grace: All this may well cause you to cry out with *David*, Psal. 84.1. *How amiable are thy Tabernacles, O Lord of Hosts.* And *one thing have I desired of the Lord, that will I seek after, that I may dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of my life to behold the beauty of the Lord, and to inquire in his Temple*, Psal. 27.4.

USE II.

It highly concerns you to fear and to pray against the return of Popish blindness. While Satan and his Angels are busie and industrious to extinguish the light of the Word, while *Rome* does join with Hell to this end, that this Land may be again overspread with Ignorance, Idolatry, Superstition, Will-Worship; 'tis your wisdom and duty, while they are plotting, to be counterworking by your Prayers. Oh cry unto the Lord to secure his own Honour, and your Priviledges, against these Enemies, which are so great invaders of both. Beg with the greatest

earneſtneſs, (and truly earneſt begging was never yet denied) that the Goſpel may continue, and a Spiritual way of Worſhip according to the direction of the Goſpel; and that *Romes* Emiſſaries may never make Merchandize of your Souls, or the Souls of your Poſterity.

USE III.

Let the blind zeal of the Papiſts make you more frequent in your acceſſes to the Throne of Grace: Though they Worſhip ignorantly, yet how much do they Worſhip? as Superſtition is wont to urge men to abundant labour. But you that ſee more reaſon to pray than they, and have more encouragement from God, than ever they underſtood, ſhould be ſhamed and quickned unto this Duty. The Papiſts indeed, if they underſtood themſelves, might well be diſheartned, becauſe their Worſhip is Will-worſhip, not of Gods appointment, but their own Invention. But you ſhould abound in Devotion, for God will not be ſought in vain as long as you ſeek him in his own way, and *your labour ſhall not be in vain in the Lord*, 1 *Cor.* 15. 58.

USE IV.

Take heed of Diſtraction in Prayer, and not-minding what you ask or what you are doing, when at the Mercy-Seat. 'Tis great hypocriſie to be preſent only in body at the Sanctuary; the heart in the mean while running away after pleaſures, covetouſneſs, vanity; and this exceedingly provokes the Lord to jealouſie, *and are you ſtronger than He?* 1 *Cor.* 10. 22. Pray, what's the difference between a *Papiſt that underſtands not*, and a *carnal Proteſtant that minds not* a word of what is ſpoken in Prayer? Or if there be any difference the Proteſtant is in the worſe caſe; becauſe having the means of Edification, he is the more without Apology, that he is not edified.

USE V.

Content not your ſelves with bare underſtanding the words of Prayer, but know the Lord you pray to; be acquainted with his Power and Truth, and how he keeps Mercy for thouſands, and particularly for you, if you are ſenſible of your ſin and miſery, and are willing that from both He ſhould deliver you. Underſtand alſo the worth of what you ask, that Spiritual and Eternal Bleſſings being highly valued, your deſires after them may be vehement, and you may wreſtle with the greater ſtrength and reſolution till you have obtain'd them.

USE VI.

Let Underſtanding and Faith in this duty of Prayer be join'd together. The Popiſh implicite Faith, to believe as the Church believes, that is, to believe they know not what, is a wretched piece of careleſneſs and preſumption, and a mad venturing of the Soul, which is ſo precious, upon an empty ſound and title. But do you ſearch the Scriptures, enquire what God has ſpoken; and firmly believe his words which are ſo faithful and worthy of all acceptation. Let your Faith in Prayer be ſtrong; and be fully perſwaded, that having ſuch Promiſes as God has made, and engaged

engaged himſelf to make good, and ſuch an Advocate in Heaven as Chriſt the Righteous; what you ask according to the Will of God ſhall in no wiſe be denied. In a word know your duty and do it, and then conclude, As certainly as *God is*, ſo certainly *he will be a rewarder of them that diligently ſeek him*, Heb. 11. 6.

Thomas Mortonus Epiſc. *Dunelm.* Apol. Cathol. Par. 2. Lib. 1. Cap. 31. De Vernac. precibus, pag. 108. *Non eſt igitur quod in hâc cauſâ, lector, hallucineris; neq; enim te fugit nos primo antiquitatem novitati: Secundo, devotionem ſanctam & divinam, cæcæ & fanaticæ ſuperſtitioni: Tertio, animæ conſolationem ſpiritualem, rigidæ ſtupiditati: Quarto, infantiæ prudentiam: Quinto, torpori conſenſum: Sexto, fictis & mentitis periculis commoda pene infinita: Septimo, ſacroſanctam deniq; Spiritus ſancti ſapientiam, humanæ ſtultitiæ ac temeritati anteponere.*

There is therefore, Reader, no room for a miſtake in this cauſe; for thou canſt not but know, that the Proteſtants prefer, 1. *Antiquity before Novelty:* 2. *Holy and divine Devotion before blind* (and properly ſo called) *fanatick Superſtition:* 3. *The ſpiritual comfort of the Soul, before rigid ſtupidity:* 4. *Prudence before childiſhneſs:* 5. *Conſent before careleſneſs:* 6. *Almoſt infinite advantages before feigned and imaginary dangers:* 7. *The holy wiſdom of the Spirit of God, before the folly and raſhneſs of men.*

SERMON X.

The Testimony of the Church is not the only, nor the chief reason, of our believing the Scripture to be the Word of God. Dr. Owen

LUKE 16. 29.

They have Moses and the Prophets, let them hear them.

AS everlasting Blessedness (mens greatest and most desirable Good) is that which God only can bestow, and the Way to it that which He only can discover: (Who knows the Lords mind like himself? Who is so sure a Guide in the Way, as He who is himself the End? Nature can neither direct us to, nor fit us for a Supernatural Happiness.) So it is not only our interest to seek it, but likewise to see, Whether what pretends to be the Rule of our walking, in order to our obtaining of it, be indeed the right one; which we can no otherwise be assured of, than by seeing that it be such a one as is given us by him to whom alone it belongs to prescribe us the Way, and who being infinitely good, as well as infinitely wise, will no more deceive us, than he can be himself deceived. Now the holy Scripture of the Old, and New Testament, is that which we profess to own as the Rule of our Faith and Life, in relation to our future Glory. It is then the wisdom of every Christian to enquire upon what account he receives this Rule, why he believes it, and submits to it, whether he be perswaded that it is of God, by God himself, or only by men; for if he can find indeed that he receives it upon the Authority of God, he may be secure of the Truth, and Sufficiency of it; but if only on that of Men, they being liable to mistakes,

miſtakes may lead him into Error, and ſo he can never be ſure that what he owns as his Rule, is indeed the right one, and of Gods own preſcribing: Or admit it really be ſo, yet if it be not received on right grounds, he will be expoſed to innumerable fears, and fluctuations, and never walk comfortably, nor conſtantly in his way, when he doubts whether it be the right, or a wrong one: The ſuperſtructure cannot be better than the foundation; and a well-ordered and comfortable Converſation will never be the effect of an ill-grounded Belief. It is good therefore in the beginning of our Courſe to be ſecure of our way, to ſee both what we believe, and why; leſt otherwiſe, we be either forced to go back, or elſe upon as light grounds ſwerve from the way, as we were at firſt perſwaded to engage in it. Our great enquiry then in this Diſcourſe will be, *Upon what account we believe the Scripture to be the Word of God? whether upon the Authority of God, or the Church?* which I ground upon theſe words, *They have Moſes and the Prophets, let them hear them.*

In this Parable, whereof theſe words are a part, we have an account of the different eſtates of a wicked man *Dives*, and a good man *Lazarus*, both in this life, and the other. In this life *Dives* had *his good things*, the whole of his happineſs, all the portion he was ever to enjoy; and *Lazarus* had *his evil things*, all the ſorrow and miſery he was ever to endure. And in the other life, we have *Lazarus* in *Abrahams Boſom*, a place and ſtate of reſt, *entered into peace*; and *Dives* in *Hell*, a ſtate of miſery, and place of torments; where finding ſo great a change, and being deeply affected with his now woful condition, he is (though in vain) deſirous, if not of releaſe, as deſpairing of that, yet at leaſt of a little eaſe; and therefore addreſſing himſelf to *Abraham*, he entreats him that *Lazarus* might be ſent *to dip* but even *the tip of his finger in water, and cool his Tongue*; but this is denied him as impoſſible, *ver. 26.* Seeing that would not do, he deſires, however, his torments might not be encreaſed by his Brethrens coming to him, whom we may ſuppoſe to have been his fellow-ſinners, and partakers with him in his riot, and luxury: Or, if you will believe ſo much charity to be among the Damned, his requeſt is, That *Lazarus* might be ſent to them to admoniſh them for their good, that ſo they might be brought to a timely Repentance, e're they came to an untimely end, and then to endleſs torments. But this is denied him too as altogether needleſs, and unprofitable, *ver.* 35; and he is told, That God had made ſufficient Proviſion for them, given them the moſt effectual means, whereby they might be brought to Repentance, in that he had given them his Written Word, *Moſes and the Prophets*, by whoſe Writings if they were not perſwaded to Repent, a Miracle would not perſwade them; *Lazarus* riſing from the Dead would no more be believed, than *Moſes* and the Prophets, whoſe Writings were among them; and therefore to them *Abraham* ſends them as a means ſufficient for the end, pretended at leaſt by *Dives* to be aimed at. *They have Moſes* Iſa. 57. 1.

and

and the Prophets, let them hear them; As if he had said, The Will of God concerning thy Brethrens duty, and the Truth of God concerning future rewards as the great motives to it, are clearly enough laid down in the Scripture; and if they believe not these things, and are not perswaded to Repentance upon the Authority of God in his Word, much less will they be moved by the Testimony of one coming from the Dead. Hence I infer, *That the Holy Scripture, or Written Word of God, is sufficient in it self, and most effectually able to convince men of the truth of those things which are contained in it.* It was so then, why not now? *Moses* and the Prophets were so; why are not the Apostles and Evangelists? is all the whole Scripture grown *Old* Testament; and so *old* as to be *decayed?* when, and by what means did it lose that Life and Power, that Authority and Efficacy it sometimes had? it had formerly more virtue to convince men than a Miracle it self, and now belike it hath less than a Council! it could have done more than a *man from the dead*, and now it can do less than *a dead man*, a sinful Pope! (for his Holiness of *Rome* may be very wicked, the Papists themselves being Judges).

From the former Proposition it will undeniably follow, *That the Scripture is sufficient in it self to convince men of its own Divineness, or its being it self the Word of God, that being one truth it doth so often assert:* The General must comprehend the Particular, and therefore if the Scripture be sufficient to satisfie the minds of men as to all that it affirms to be truth, it must needs be able to satisfie them as to this too, that the whole of it is the Word of God.

But this our Adversaries will not allow, and therefore instead of taking it for granted, or resting on this single proof, we must here put it to the Question, *From whence the Scripture hath its Authority? or upon what grounds we are to believe it to be the Word of God?* If you will give the Papists leave to answer, they will presently tell you, *Upon the sole Authority of the Church*, or, *because the Church declares it to be the Word of God*, and *that without the determination of the Church, it hath very little Authority, or weight in it*, and you are *no more bound to believe the Gospel of* Mathew, *than the History of* Livy; Nay, one says plainly, That *but for the Church, you are no more bound to believe the Scripture than* Esops *Fables*; and you may be sure the Man was in earnest, when you do but consider how many incredible things another of them (alledged at large by our learned *Whitaker*) musters up out of the Scripture, which he would fain perswade the World would never be believed, if the Church did not interpose her Testimony; and yet as broad as the Blasphemy mentioned is, another of the same Party minceth the Matter, and says, the Words might be *piously spoken*: And if a private Doctor of the Church of *Rome* may thus transubstantiate Blasphemy into Piety, or make that pass for *Pious*, which is really *Blasphemous*, I see no reason why a Pope might not add his Authority, and make it *Canonical* too. But that we may give the best Account of the Controversie before us:

Surdis. apud *Chamier.*

1. Something

1. Some things muſt be premiſed by way of Explication, for the better underſtanding of Terms.
2. The State of the Queſtion muſt be laid down.
3. The Truth confirmed.
4. Popiſh Objections anſwered.
5. Some Application made.

1. For Explication of Terms, let us ſee,

1. What we mean by the *Scripture*. By that therefore is underſtood the Word of God, declaring his mind concerning mens Happineſs and Duty, or teaching us what we are to believe concerning God, and how we are to obey him, as it was at firſt revealed by himſelf to the Apoſtles and Prophets, and by them delivered by word of mouth, and afterward for the perpetuity and uſefulneſs of it, committed to Writing as we now have it, in the Books of the *Old* and *New Teſtament*: So that *the Word of God*, and *the Scripture* are the ſame materially, and differ only in this, That the *Word of God* doth not in it ſelf imply its being written, nor exclude it, but may be conſidered indifferently as to either; whereas *the Scripture* ſignifies the ſame Word, only with the addition of its being committed to Writing.

2. What is meant by *Authority*, when we enquire, whence the Scripture hath its Authority. Authority in this Buſineſs is a Power of Commanding or Perſwading, or (as ſome phraſe it) Convincing, ariſing from ſome Excellency in the Thing or Perſon veſted with ſuch Authority. Whatever hath Authority *de facto*, ſo far forth hath eſteem and honour, or reverence yielded to it, as whatever hath Authority *de jure* hath ſuch eſteem or honour of due belonging to it, and anſwering it as its correlate; and both the one and the other is founded on ſome Excellency, ſometimes of Nature (both in Perſons and Things,) ſometimes of Office and Dignity, ſometimes of Knowledg, ſometimes of Vertue and Manners, ſometimes of Prudence (as in Perſons;) according to each of which a ſuitable reſpect and honour is due to the Authority therefrom ariſing; and as any Man excels in any of theſe, ſo he hath Authority in that, though he may not in other Things. Thus he that excels in the knowledg of the *Law*, may have Authority in that, though he may have none in *Phyſick* or *Divinity*, in which he may not *excel*: and an honeſt Man, that *excels* in Morality, may on that account have the Authority of a *Witneſs*, though not of a *Judg*. Now when we ſpeak of the Authority of the Scripture, and ask from whence it hath it? we do but enquire, Whence it is, that the Scripture perſwades, convinces, or binds us to believe it, or commands us to aſſent to it, as the Word God? or whereon its Power of ſo doing is founded? whether it be not ſome Excellency inherent in it ſelf, or whether it be only ſomething forrein and extrinſecal to it?

Camero de Verbo Dei.

3. What we mean by Faith, when it is demanded, Why we believe the Scripture to be the Word of God? Faith, ſo far as it concerns the underſtanding

underſtanding (for in ſome Acts of Faith the Will bears part) is an aſſent yielded to ſomething propoſed under the appearance (at leaſt) of Truth, built upon the Teſtimony of another; and therefore according as the Teſtimony is, for the ſake of which we believe any thing, accordingly will our Faith be: If it be the Teſtimony of a Man or Men, our Faith will be an humane Faith; but if the Teſtimony be Divine, or we believe a thing becauſe God himſelf aſſerts it, we call it a Divine Faith. Only we muſt remember, that a truly Divine Faith hath always God for its Author; ſo that three things concur to the producing the Act of ſuch a Faith. 1. The Truth believed, which is the Object of it. 2. The Teſtimony of God concerng that Truth, which is the Formal Reaſon, and Ground of this Faith. 3. The Efficiency of God producing it, or working it in the Mind. Now when we ſpeak of *believing* the Scripture to be the Word of God, we ſpeak of a Divine Faith: A man may upon the Credit of his Parents, of his Miniſter, of a particular Church, or of the Church Catholick (if ſuch a Teſtimony can be had) believe the Scripture to be the Word of God; but the queſtion will be, what kind of Faith that is, whether ſuch a one as God requires him to receive the Scripture with?

Objectum materiale.
Objectum formale.

4. What we underſtand by the Church in the Queſtion: The Church may be taken either for the Univerſality of Believers in all places of the World, ſo as to comprehend private Saints, as well as publick Officers, People as well as Paſtors, and thoſe of former ages as well as the preſent, Prophets themſelves, and Apoſtles, and Pen-men of the Scripture; or we may take it for that part of the Catholick Church which lives together in the ſame age call, it if you pleaſe the preſent Catholick Church, comprehending in it all the Believers, People as well as Paſtors, alive at the ſame time, in the ſeveral parts of the whole World. Or elſe, we may underſtand the Church in the Popiſh ſenſe, only for the preſent Church; and that too, for the Church of *Rome*, which they call Catholick; and that again, only for the Paſtors of it, excluding the People; and they again may be conſidered either ſeparately, or in conjunction, as meeting together in a General Council; and that either by themſelves without the Pope, or together with him: Or laſtly as repreſented by him, or *virtually* contained in him; for this great name *the Church*, dwindles at laſt into one only man: But ſure he is no ſmall one that contains ſo many in him; for if we believe the Papiſts (not only, though eſpecially the Jeſuits) the Pope, in this Controverſie, is nothing elſe but the Church Catholick compacted, and thruſt into a ſingle perſon, in whom all thoſe ſeveral Excellencies, which are ſcatter'd among the Members, do, as in the Head, *collectively* reſide. And ſo the Catholickneſs they vaunt ſo much of, is crowded into a narrow compaſs, for thoſe whether Paſtors or Members of the Church that lived formerly are firſt cut off, and the Church is reduced to the preſent age; then the people (as excreſcencies) are pared away too, and the bulkineſs of the Church thereby leſſened,

ſened, the Officers or Paſtors only remaining; and yet theſe too muſt be contracted into a Council, and that at laſt Epitomized into a Pope, who is but the Epitome of an Epitome, and ſcarce ſo much as a *ſmall Synopſis* of that *Voluminous* thing, *the Church*, they talk ſo *largely* of.

2. For the ſtate of the Queſtion, theſe things being premiſed, take it thus; In ſome things we agree with them, in ſome we differ from them.

1. In ſome we agree:

1. That the Scripture of the Old and New Teſtament, which we own (who yet exclude the Apocryphal Books of one ſort, or other), *is the Word of God*, is acknowledged by them, as well as by us.

2. Conſequently, That it is *in it ſelf true and of Divine Authority*, and that it doth not depend upon the Church as to that Authority and Truth which *in it ſelf* it hath, or that the Teſtimony of the Church doth not make it to be *true*, or to be *the Word of God*; the Papiſts themſelves (at leaſt the moſt wary among them) will (be ſure in words) grant: and therefore they have coyned a diſtinction for the nonce; they tell us, That the Scripture hath a twofold Authority, one *in it ſelf*, as it is true, and comes from God; the other *in relation to us*, as it binds us to receive, and believe it: The former of theſe they own to be in the Scripture, Antecedently to the Teſtimony of the Church. The diſtinction is vain, when all Authority is in relation to another, over whom either *de facto* it is, or *de jure* it ought to be exerciſed. But let it paſs.

3. That every Chriſtian is bound with a Divine Faith to receive the Scripture as the Word of God, they grant as well as we do.

4. That the holy Spirit hath a hand in mens believing the Scripture to be the Word of God, allow the Papiſts their ſence, and they will likewiſe yield no leſs than we. That the Faith whereby men own the Scriptures, (if it be a Divine one, as they ſay it is), is wrought in the hearts of men by the Spirit of God, they do grant, and muſt, unleſs they will avow themſelves to be *Pelagians*.

5. And laſtly, That the Church allow us our ſenſe, may be an help to us, and furtherance to our Faith in receiving the Scripture, as the Word of God, we will grant as well as they. That the Univerſal Concurrence of all Believers in receiving the Scripture, and the Teſtimony they do, and in all ages have, in their way and capacity given to it, is a ſtrong Argument to perſwade diſſenters to ſubmit to the Divine Authority of it, we eaſily yield. And that it is the duty of the preſent Church, during its time, to labour to preſerve the Scripture pure and intire, and to hold it forth to others, and endeavour to perſwade them of its Divineneſs, and ſo to perform the part of a Teacher, we are willing likewiſe to yield. And ſo in a word we acknowledg the uſefulneſs of the Churches Teſtimony, as an external help, and that by which ſome benefit may be reaped by men at the beginning of their Faith; for it is the foundation of an humane Faith, and ſufficient for the producing of

that: And when a man hath so far yielded, as to receive the Scripture as Gods Word, though only on the credit of Men, yet coming afterward to peruse and study it, and look more narrowly into it, he may then come to see better, and more solid grounds for his belief, and God working on his heart by the Word; he may come to receive it with a Divine Faith, which at first he did only with an humane: As *Joh.* 4. the men of *Samaria* who first believed Christ for the *Womans words*, did afterwards believe him, *because they heard himself.* Thus far therefore there is some agreement between them and us. So that the Question is not concerning the *Object* of our Faith, the thing to be believed, for both acknowledg it (in this business) to be the Divineness of the Scripture; nor concerning the *Efficient cause* of that Faith, for both will own it to be the Spirit which works this Faith in the heart: But concerning *the Medium, or Argument whereby the Spirit works it, and so the ground and foundation of our Faith, that which is the formal reason why we believe the Scripture to be the Word of God.*

2. This therefore is *the thing wherein we and they differ*; something they affirm which we deny, and something we affirm which they deny.

1. They affirm *the Testimony of the present Church*, (and that must be of *Rome* only now; for they count that only the Catholick one, *that is of the Pastors of it convened in a General Council, either with the Pope*, (as some of them say) *or without him* (as others) *or virtually in him* (as others) *to be the only sufficient ground of mens believing the Scripture to be the Word of God*; and so tell us, *That the Spirit bears witness to the Divinity of the Scripture by the Testimony of the Church, and makes use of that as the Medium, or Argument by which he perswades men to receive the Scripture as the Word of God, and that without that Testimony or Antecedently to it, men cannot know, nor are bound to believe the Scripture so to be.* This we deny.

2. We affirm on the other side, *That the Testimony of the Spirit of God in the Word it self, witnessing it to be of God, by that stamp and impress, or* (which comes to the same) *by those notes and marks of Divinity which every-where appear in it, is the immediate and principal, and a sufficient reason of our believing it to be the Word of God, and the Medium the Spirit useth in working Faith in us, or making us assent to the Divinity of the Scripture.* So that as the Spirit working inwardly in our hearts, moves as the *Efficient* of our Faith; so the Scripture it self in its own intrinsecal beauty, lustre, power and excellency, is that which moves us in the way of an *Object*, or *Medium*, to yield our assent to its being of God. By this the Spirit of God as the Author of the Scripture witnesseth it to be of God, and by an internal application of this to our minds, induceth us to assent to its so being. The Testimony of the Spirit in the Word is open, publick, general to all, if they have but eyes to see it, whereas the inward application of it by the Efficiency of the Spirit is only to Believers.

This

This they deny; and this we shall first (though more briefly) prove, and then disprove (as well as we deny) what they assert.

Arg. 1. The Holy Ghost in Scripture calls us to the Scripture it self, and Gods Authority only in it, (and not to the Church) for the setling of our belief of its Divinity; and therefore in the Scripture it self we have a sufficient Argument to move us to believe its coming from God. *Isa.* 8. 20. we are sent *to the Law and to the Testimony*; the Prophets generally propound what they deliver, meerly in the name, and on the Authority of God; their usual stile is, *Thus saith the Lord*, and, *The word of the Lord*; they do no-where send us to the Church to know, Whether it be so, or not, but leave it with us as being of it self (that is, without the Testimony of the Church) sufficient to convince us, and if we will not believe it, at our own peril be it. So in the Text, *Abraham* (that is indeed Christ, whose mind *Abraham* in this Parable is brought in speaking,) sends *Dives* Brethren to *Moses and the Prophets*; and our Saviour Christ, *Joh.* 5. 39. sends the *Jews* to the *Scriptures*, bids them *search them*, and so *ver.* 46, 47; and *Luke Act.* 17. 11. commends the *Bereans*, not that they sent up to *Jerusalem* to the Church there, or waited for a General Council to assure them of the Divineness of what was preached to them, but that *they daily searched the Scriptures, to see if those things were so.* But all this would be in vain, our labour would be lost in searching the Scriptures, and looking into them for the confirmation of themselves, if there were not something in them sufficient to perswade us of their having God for their Author, but at last we must have recourse to the Church to assure us of it. Why are we sent thus far about, if a nearer way be at hand?

Arg. 2. Those Properties which the Holy Ghost in the Scripture attributes to the Scripture will prove the same. It is *light*, *Prov.* 6. 23. *The Commandment is a lamp, and the Law is light.* Psal. 119. 105. *A lamp to my feet, and a light to my path: A light shining in a dark place*, 2 Pet. 1. 19. and sure that which is light may discover it self. He that needs another to tell him what is light, wants eyes. *Heb.* 4. 12. *It is quick and powerful, and sharper than a two-edged sword*, it *enters* into the Soul, and therefore by its own power and efficacy discovers it self to us as well as us to our selves. It is *like as a fire, and like a hammer that breaks the rock in pieces*, *Jer.* 23. 29. So likewise, 1 *Cor.* 14. 24, 25. and *Psal.* 19. 7, 8. From both which we may argue, That Word which *convinceth* men, *judgeth* them, makes *manifest the secrets* of their *hearts*; that again, *which converts the soul, makes wise the simple, rejoiceth the heart, enlightens the eyes*, is sufficiently able to discover it self to be of God, though the Church should not give in her Testimony; but such a Word is the Scripture: therefore, *&c.* And further, Why may not Gods Word discover its Author, as well as his Works do? If *the Heavens declare the Glory of God, and the Firmament shews his handy work*, Psal. 19. 1. If even the least Creatures preach God to us, they that bear not his Image on them, yet have some *vestigia*, Deum. Presentem clamat qualibet herba

ſome footſteps of him, and much more his greater and more noble Works, the Glorious Fabrick of Heaven and Earth, and Man the moſt excellent of his Creatures on Earth, ſhew forth that Excellency in them, which manifeſts it ſelf to be from none but God; and he hath in a word, left ſuch an impreſs of Himſelf upon his Works, as that they generally proclaim themſelves to be his. Why ſhould it be thought incredible, that God ſhould leave the like notices of Himſelf upon his Word, and ſtamp that upon it which might plainly evidence it to be his? Nay, if Men do commonly make themſelves known by their Works, Writers by their Skill, Artiſts by their curious Pieces; if *Apelles* could have drawn ſuch a Picture, *Phidias* have cut ſuch a Statue, *Cicero* have pen'd ſuch an Oration, that any who had judgment in ſuch things might have ſaid, Such a Man and no other, was the Author of ſuch a Work; ſurely then much more may God in ſo lively a manner expreſs Himſelf in his Word, as clearly to notifie to us, that it is his. And if any ſhould ſay, God could have done it, but would not; I deſire to know a good reaſon, Why God who hath left us ſo plain and conſpicuous Evidences of his Wiſdom, Power and Goodneſs on his Creatures, *would* not leave the print of Himſelf in the like manner upon his Word?

Vid. Rob. Baron. cont. Turnebul.

Arg. 3. Gods revealing Himſelf to us in the Scripture is the firſt and higheſt Revelation upon which our Faith is built, and therefore that Revelation is ſufficient to manifeſt it ſelf to us, even without the Churches Teſtimony. The reaſon of the Conſequence is, Becauſe Faith (a Divine one ſuch as we ſpeak of) being always built upon Revelation, whatever it be which is the firſt Revelation whereon our Faith is built muſt be ſufficient to notifie it ſelf to us; otherwiſe our Faith is not founded upon any Revelation at all, if that Revelation needs ſomething elſe which is not Revelation to give credit to it: Or if that which is the firſt Revelation, yet needs another to make it manifeſt to us, it is not it ſelf the firſt, which is a palpable contradiction. And for the Antecedent, I thus make it appear: In the buſineſs of Faith, Either we muſt come to ſome firſt Revelation, or we muſt go on from one to another without any end: For either the Faith whereby I believe this Revelation, *That the Scripture is the Word of God*, to be Divine, is founded upon this very Revelation it ſelf, *viz.* the *Scripture*, (which ſo many times tells me it is of God), or upon ſome other Revelation; if upon this it ſelf, then I have what I would, that this is the firſt Revelation whereon my Faith is built: But if on another, I ask again, Muſt I believe that for it ſelf, or for ſome other; if for it ſelf, then that muſt be the firſt; if for ſome other, I ſhall ask again, Am I to believe that for it ſelf, or for another, and ſo there will be no end, no firſt Revelation on which my Faith is founded, but I muſt go higher, and higher, even *in infinitum*. Other Arguments might be produced to confirm what we aſſert, and are by our Divines, but I intended brevity in theſe, and the truth we maintain will be more confirmed by what I am in the next place to ſay againſt the Papiſts Aſſertion.

2. That

2. That therefore the *Teſtimony of the Church is not the only ſufficient ground*, (nor indeed a ſufficient one at all,) *of our believing the Divinity of the Scripture*, I ſhall prove by ſeveral Arguments.

Arg. 1: I argue from *Epheſ.* 2. 20. *And are built upon the foundation of the Apoſtles and Prophets.* The Scripture is the foundation of the Church, and therefore hath not its Authority, even *in reſpect of us*, from the Church, but on the contrary the Church hath its Authority from the Scripture, upon which it depends in its very being, and without which it is not the Church, nor if built upon any other foundation; it hath no Authority but from the Scripture, none in it ſelf but as thence it derives it, and we know none it hath but as there we find it. And this is ſpoken of the true Church, and not meerly the Church in the Popiſh ſenſe. If ever we would find out the nature and definition of the Church, we muſt ſeek it in the Scripture, where alone it is that we ſee it to be Gods Will to have a Church upon Earth, and by what means it is called, and of whom it is conſtituted, and with what Power and Priviledges it is endowed. He that will queſtion, Whether the Scripture be the Word of God will as eaſily queſtion, Whether the Church be the Church of God; or, Whether God have any Church or not. Now if the Church have all its Authority from the Scripture, by which alone it is a Church, and known to be ſo, how can it be with any reaſon ſaid, That the Scripture hath its Authority, even *as to us* from the Church? For if the Church have no Authority but from the Scripture, than the Authority of the Church muſt ſuppoſe that of the Scripture, and the Scripture muſt be own'd, or the Church cannot be own'd; for who knows what, or which the Church is, but as the Scripture deſcribes it to us? and ſo the Scripture hath not its Authority, *as to us*, from the Church. For can the Scripture both give Authority to the Church, and yet receive its own Authority from it? Can it authorize the Church before it be it ſelf authorized by it? Can it give the Church a Power to communicate Authority to it, and yet hath no Authority hitherto it ſelf? Nay, Can it be conſiſtent with common ſenſe, that the Scripture ſhould give the Church a Power to bind men to the belief of it, and yet have no Power in it ſelf to bind the Church to the belief of it? Again, when they ſay the Scripture hath its Authority from the Church, I ask, How ſhall I know there is a Church? for if I be one that own no ſuch thing as the Scripture (which the Church is perſwading me to believe) withal I own no ſuch Society as the Church, and how will they prove there is ſuch a one, but by the Scripture? for I who am ſuppoſed to acknowledg no Church, do acknowledg no Authority it hath, and ſhall not take its own Word: And yet if I grant there be a Church, How ſhall I know that ſuch a company of men as pretend to be the Church, are really ſo? I ſhall not take their own Teſtimony, I am not ſatisfied in their being witneſſes to themſelves: And if they will prove themſelves to be the Church by the Scripture, then either the Scripture muſt have

Autho-

Authority *as to me* before the Church, or else they prove one obscure thing by another. If they say there be certain signs and marks of the Church inherent in it, by which it may be known: Alas I know not those marks but by the Scripture which describes the Church. If they say the Spirit witnesseth by those marks that this is the Church, why may not I say the same of the Scripture, and so that be known without the Testimony of the Church to be the Word of God, as well as the Church to be the Church of God? And yet after all this, granting this Society of Men to be the Church, yet How shall I know that this Church is Infallible? and if I know it not to be so, I am not so mad as to build my Faith upon its Authority. If they say because it is governed by the Holy Ghost; How shall I know that? for it is not obvious to me that it is: If they say because Christ hath promised that it should; I ask, where? Where can it be but in the Scripture? sure then the Scripture must be owned, and have its Authority *as to me*, or their proof is invalid, and they do but trifle instead of arguing.

Before I proceed to another Argument, let us examine what is excepted against this. To this Text, *Eph.* 2. 20. It is replied by some of the Papists.

Excep. 1. 'That by *Foundation* is not meant the *Scripture written* by 'the *Apostles and Prophets*, but their Preaching,

Ans. But, 1. If that were granted, it would not prejudice our Cause; what they Writ and Preached is the same Truth, and differs not essentially, but only in the way of Delivery, one being delivered to their present Hearers *vivâ voce*, and the other by Writing transmitted likewise to Posterity. *Act.* 26. 22. *Witnessing, both to small and great, and saying no other things, than what the Prophets and* Moses *did say should come.* So *Act.* 17.

2. The Preaching of the Apostles and Prophets did last but a while, whereas *Paul* speaks of the lasting, perpetual Foundation of the Church.

3. If he speaks only of the Preaching of the Apostles and Prophets, How comes he to joyn these two together? for the Prophets were long since dead, and their Preaching (if that only were the Foundation of the Church) could be the Foundation of that Church only, which lived with them, and heard them.

Excep. 'He meant therefore, say some of our Adversaries, the *New-Te-'stament* Prophets, which Preached at the same time with the Apostles.'

Ans. But that is not so easily proved, as said, for though such Prophets are mentioned in some places of the *New-Testament*, it doth not follow, That they must needs be understood here; for Why doth the Apostle mention them only, and not Evangelists too, nay Pastors and Teachers likewise, whom he joyns altogether. *Eph.* 4. and who did at the same time Preach the same Truth which the Apostles did? Besides that, we find by the Doctrine of the Prophets mentioned in the *New-Testament*,

Teſtament, the Truth Preached and Written by the Prophets under the *Old*, commonly underſtood. So *Pet.* 2. 1. 19. *A more ſure Word of Prophecy. Heb.* 1. 1. *God ſpake to the Fathers by the Prophets.* So alſo, *Rom.* 1. 2. and *Luke* 1. 70. The Apoſtles under the *New Teſtament*, were the Chief that Taught, though *New-Teſtament* Prophets, as likewiſe Evangeliſts, Paſtors, and Teachers did Preach the ſame Doctrine; as formerly under the *Old-Teſtament*, the Prophets that then lived were the Chief, though others beſides, as the Levites, *Chron.* 2. 30. 22. did *Teach the good knowledg of the Lord.*

Excep. 'But, ſay they again, the *Epheſians* were not built upon *Pauls* 'Writings, which were not then extant, but on his Preaching; and 'therefore theſe other kind of Prophets muſt be underſtood, on whoſe 'Preaching (together with the Apoſtles) they were Built.

Anſ. The Preaching the Truth or Writing it makes no difference, but ſtill it is the ſame Truth, which is the foundation of the Church, whether it be Written or Preached. And though the *Epheſians* were built on the Word as *Preached* by *Paul*, yet What hinders, but they might likewiſe be Built on the Word, *as Written* by former Prophets, whom though they could not now hear, yet they might Read? And *Paul* himſelf proves what he *Preached* by what the Prophets had *Writ*, that ſo both the Word *Preached* and *Written* might be propounded to the *Epheſians* as one and the ſame Foundation of their Faith.

Excep. 2. 'They ſay, That by the Church in this Place is underſtood, 'not the Paſtors, but the People, becauſe the Paſtors were they that 'Preached; and therefore if they were meant, it would follow, that 'they ſhould be Built upon Themſelves.

Anſ. 1. It is moſt abſurd to ſay, That the Paſtors and Doctors of the Church are not Built upon the Doctrine of the Apoſtles and Prophets. Who ever heard of one Foundation for the Faith of the Teachers, & another for the Faith of the People? It ſeems then, by their own Confeſſion, the Pope and his Clergy are not Built upon the Foundation of the Apoſtles and Prophets, and if they have not this Foundation, I am ſure they have no better. The Faith of Paſtors and People is the ſame; and why is not the Foundation the ſame too? Are they fit to Build up Others in the Faith of the Scriptures, who are not Themſelves Built upon the Scriptures? And it is idle to ſay, they are Built on the Holy Spirit: for will they ſeparate the Spirit from the Scripture? What doth the Spirit Teach but out of, and according to the Scripture? to be *Led by the Spirit*, and yet *Built on the Scriptures*, are very well conſiſtent.

Arg. 2. It is not abſurd to ſay, That the Teachers of the Church are Built on the Doctrine they Teach, though *Not as they Teach it*, yet *as They have* before *received & believed it:* Indeed they ought to offer nothing to Others as the Foundation of their Faith, but what is the Foundation of their Own: nor to hazard the Souls of their Hearers upon any worſe Bottom, than

than they would venture their own Souls. And it doth not follow, from hence, That they are taught by themselves, or are a Foundation to themselves, but only that the Doctrine they have themselves Believed and are Built upon, they deliver it to Others, that they too may believe it, and be Built upon it.

Arg. 2. The Doctrine delivered in the Scripture doth not, as to our receiving it, depend upon the Church, and therefore neither doth the Scripture it self: the Doctrine of the Scripture, and the Scripture it self, are really the same, and differ but in an accident of being Written, or not Written. The same Doctrines we have in the Scripture were published, and known before they were written, and they did not then depend upon the Authority of the Church, and why should they now? Doth the Writing of them make them of less Authority, or less credible, or less able to convince Mens minds than they formerly were? Upon the Authority of what Church did *Adam*, *Seth*, *Enoch*, *Abraham*, *&c.* receive the Word of God, when it was yet unwritten? What Council was there, what Pope to perswade them of it? And how come the same Truths to have less Power and Efficacy to perswade us, than them? Will our Adversaries say the Patriarchs received the Word immediately from God himself? True: some of them did; but what is that to the Church, and her Authority? Or will they say, those Patriarchs from whom others received the Word were Infallible? They will hardly be able to prove it. How came *Abraham* to perswade his Wife to tell a lie, and expose her Chastity thereby for the saving of his Life, if he were Infallible? And how came other Patriarchs to allow Polygamy if they were Infallible? And do not the Papists themselves tell us that the Church of the Jews was not Infallible, and that Infallibility is the peculiar Privileg of the Gospel-Church, the Promise of it being made only to that? And to come down lower, *Moses* received many Things of the Lord, which were immediately received by the People, as the Law of the Passover, *Exod.* 12. and 24. 3. where the People presently answer, That *All the words which the Lord* had said, they would *do.* Did the People themselves (the Church in the Wilderness, *Act.* 7. 18.) give Authority to these Laws, or did the Council of the Elders do it? We find nothing of their being convened together upon any such account, as to consider whether Gods Laws should be received or not: Or did they receive them on the Authority of any other Church? If so, which was it, where was it? Or lastly, was *Moses* an *Old-Testament* Pope, and the *Virtual Church* of *Israel*? Then by like that Church was Infallible as well as the Gospel, contrary to their own Doctrine. That *Moses* was infallibly Inspired in all that he commanded the People from God, is sure; but that ever he prefsed them to receive the Word of God on his own Authority, or any but Gods, can never be proved. If they say that the People received the Word on the account of the Miracles wrought by *Moses*, that is more to our purpose than

Becan. Man. Controv. l. 1. c. 3.

than theirs. And what shall we say of the Law *written in Mens hearts*? on whose Authority is that received? it is the same for substance with the Law *written in the Word*; and must there be the Testimony of the Church to assure men that even this Law too is of God? Or, if it be acknowledged for its own light and power whereby it manifests it self to be of God, Why may not the Law written in the Word be so acknowledged too? But come we further down; On whose Authority were the Sermons of the Prophets, after *Moses*'s time received? When they spoke to the People in the Name of the Lord, did they ever cite the Testimony of the Church to vouch what they said to be indeed from the Lord? Or, did they ever seek the suffrages of the high Priests, and Governours of the Church to establish their Doctrine as Divine? their ordinary stile is, *Thus saith the Lord*, not thus saith the Church; or the Church says, That the Lord saith thus. Lastly, if we descend to the Times of the New Testament, we shall find the same there: When our Saviour Christ himself preached, what he spoke was as much the Word of God when he spake it, as now that it is written; but neither did he refer himself as to the Divinity of his Doctrine, to the Authority of the Church; nor did any believe it on that account. He did not refer it to the Church, for he did *not receive Testimony from men*, Joh. 5. 34. No not from *John Baptist* himself, though of no small Authority in the *Jewish* Church, and generally taken to be a Prophet. Though *John*, as his duty was, did bear witness to Christ, and point to him, *Joh.* 1. *This is the Lamb of God, &c.* yet Christ had no need of this Testimony, to make himself be received as the *Messiah*, or what he preached as the Word of God, as if the one or the other could not have been received without it. He therefore tells the *Jews*, *Joh.* 5. 36. That he had *greater witness than that of John*; first his *Works*, then his *Father himself*, ver. 37. then the Written Word, ver. 39. *Search the Scriptures, &c. they are they that testifie of me.* All this while here is not one tittle of the Church, and its Testimony; and if that be the only means whereby men can be assured of the Divineness of the Word, How comes Christ to overlook it? And that they who believed Christs Doctrine did not believe it on the Authority of the Church is clear; for the Church of the *Jews* was generally corrupt, erred in many things, and therefore was unfit; and it was, especially as to its Guides and Officers, generally against Christ, and therefore unwilling to give Testimony to him; it neither own'd him, nor his Doctrine; so that they who received and believed Christs Preaching did it on some other account than the Testimony of the then-present Church. If the Papists shall say, they received his Doctrine on the account of Christs own Divine Authority; I would enquire How they came to know he had any such Authority? for that Christ was the Messiah, and consequently had this Divine Authority, were some of the Truths he preached. If they say, That Christs Doctrine was received either upon the account of his Miracles, or of its agreement with the

Scripture of the Old Teſtament; they ſay more for us than for themſelves, and either way deſert their cauſe. And if we look to the Apoſtles that followed Chriſt, and preached the ſame Doctrine, we ſhall ſee that it was not received on the account of the Church, no more than commanded to the hearers thereon: *Act.* 2. upon *Peters* Preaching, three thouſand believed, *they gladly received the word*, ver. 41. they did not it ſeems, expect the Teſtimony of the Church to tell them, Whether it were the Word or not. *Act.* 4. 4. we read of either five thouſand more, or ſo many as made up the whole five thouſand. And *Act.* 3. the *Samaritans* receive the Goſpel on *Philips* Preaching, and afterward the Eunuch; and (to paſs by others) the *Beræans*, and *Theſſalonians* receive the Word, *Act.* 17. Of the former it is ſaid, *v.* 11. That they *received the Word with all readineſs of mind, and daily ſearched the Scriptures, &c.* Of the latter *Paul* teſtifies, 1 *Theſſ.* 2. 13. *That they received the Word, not as the Word of Man, but as it is indeed the Word of God.* All this while here is no Church interpoſing its Authority, or aſſerting the Divineneſs of what *Peter* or *Philip*, or *Paul* preached. On what account then did theſe People believe the Word preached by the Apoſtles? On the Authority of the Church ſay the Papiſts: But what Church? "Why ſays "a great one among them, ſpeaking of the *Theſſalonians*, *the voice of* Staplet. "*Paul was the voice of the Church*, when he preached to the *Theſſalonians*, "and ſo they in receiving the Word on *Pauls* Authority received it on "the Authority of the Church: Say the ſame of *Peter* and *Philip*. *Paul* it ſeems then was the Church, or elſe how could *Pauls* Preaching be the voice of the Church? What kind of Church then was *Paul?* was he the Church *Virtual*, was he a Pope, and was *Peter* and *Philip*, and the reſt of the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts ſo too? A bleſſed Church ſure that had ſo many Popes, or rather a miſerable one, that either had no viſible Head, or had ſo many. If they ſay, *Pauls* voice was the voice of the Church, becauſe he was an Officer of it, by whom the Church publiſhed the Doctrine ſhe believed and was to propagate: *Paul* was indeed an Officer of the Church, but yet made ſo *by Jeſus Chriſt himſelf, not an Apoſtle of men, nor by man*, Gal. 1. 1. And the Doctrine he preached was no otherwiſe the Doctrine of the Church, than as it was the ſame which the Church believed, but never taught it him; for he *received it not of men, neither was taught it, but by the Revelation of Jeſus Chriſt*, *ver.* 12. and therefore they might more reaſonably have ſaid, That the voice of *Paul* was the voice of Chriſt, the Word he preached being more properly the Word of Chriſt who was the Author of it, than the Word of the Church who only received it of Chriſt. But what will become of this fine invention of our Jeſuit, if the *Theſſalonians* did not receive the Word on the Authority of *Paul* himſelf, whether in his ſingle or repreſentative Capacity, (or call it as you pleaſe)? and ſure they did not: For then his Authority muſt be own'd, e're on the account of that his Preaching could be believed; but both *Paul* and his Authority (what-

(whatever it were) was unknown to the *Theſſalonians* when he firſt preached among them, and therefore could not induce them to believe what he taught. The ſame we may ſay of the other Apoſtles in their firſt planting the Goſpel, when they came to the Gentiles; they were unknown till they made themſelves and their Authority known by their Preaching: And when they came to the *Jews* where they were known, yet they were not truſted, nor their Apoſtolical Authority acknowledged, and ſo it could prevail neither with the one, nor with the other till their Doctrine was firſt believed.

Arg. 3. The Scripture hath its Authority in relation *to us* before the Church paſs its judgment concerning it, and therefore it hath not that Authority from the Church. This will appear;

1. By the Conceſſion of the Papiſts themſelves, who acknowledg, That the Church only declares the Scripture to be Authentick, but doth not make it ſo; ſure then it was Authentick in it ſelf before that Declaration of the Church, which is only a pronouncing that to be, which was before. And if it be in it ſelf Authentick it is ſo *to us* too, that is, it hath in it ſelf a power of binding us to the belief of it, ſo ſoon as we come to hear of it, whether the Church hath declared its authenticknes or not.

2. If the Scripture hath not its Authority as *to us* before the Judgment of the Church, then either it muſt be a private or publick Judgment of the Church which gives it that Authority: a private one it cannot be; for when we ſpeak of the Authority of the Scripture *as to us*, it is underſtood of all Chriſtians every-where, and it is not fit that a private Judgment of the Church, or (which is the ſame) the Judgment of a private Church ſhould give Laws to all the reſt: Nor can it be the publick Teſtimony, or that of the Catholick Church, for none ſuch can be produced by the Papiſts, from whence the Scripture hath its Authority; let them if they can ſhew us the firſt General Council that ever declared the Scripture to be the Word of God. The Council of *Jeruſalem*, *Act.* 15. if it were a General one, is the firſt we read of, and that toucheth not the Point in hand, doth not declare the Scripture to be Authentick, but takes it for granted. They that were there met cite the Scripture of the Old Teſtament, and thereby own its Authority, but do not then firſt eſtabliſh it; and *Peter* and the reſt do the like in their Preaching, *Act.* 2. 3. and dare the Papiſts ſay then, That the Old Teſtament was not Authentick before this Council? Had the Church hitherto no certain Canon, nor Authentick Scripture to be the Rule of its Faith? After this Council we find no General one till that of *Nice*, and was the Church of God all this while too, for three hundred years, without the Canon of the Scripture? To ſay nothing that the Council of *Nice* it ſelf did never define which it was, but acknowledged it as already received.

3. If a Council meets to declare the Divine Authority of the Scrip-

ture, we would know by what Authority it meets? If the several Pastors of the Church come together on the Authority and by the command of the Scripture it self, then it hath its Authority before they meet, else it could not make it their duty so to do: If by some Revelation or impulse of the Spirit without the Scripture, what kind of Spirit is that which acts in separation from the Scripture? And if the Papists will affirm this, let them no more call themselves *good Catholicks*, but even the *worst of Fanaticks*.

Arg. 4. The Authority of the Church is not more certain or clear *as to us*, than that of the Scripture, and therefore the Scripture cannot have its Authority from it. That which proves another thing must it self be more clear and better known: But that the Authority of the Church is not better known to us than that of the Scripture will soon appear; for whatever Authority the Church hath, she must prove it either from her self, or from something else: If from any thing else, it must either be from the Testimony of those that are out of the Church, but they know not the Church, nor any Authority it hath; or from the Scripture, but then the Authority of the Scripture must be more known than that of the Church; or from the Spirit, but how will they make it out that they have the Testimony of the Spirit for them, otherwise than by the Scripture, in and by which he is wont to bear witness? If they say the Spirit witnesseth to the Authority of the Church *inwardly*, so as to perswade the minds of Dissenters that the Church is the Church of God; this is meerly beg'd, and not proved, and yet will not satisfie neither; for we ask not What is the Efficient Cause of mens believing the Authority of the Church, but What is the Argument whereon that belief is grounded, and whereby the Church perswades Men of its own Authority? Or else on the other side, if the Church prove its Authority from it self, then the same thing shall be proved by it self: But yet I ask, What Judgment of the Church is it, whereby its Authority is proved? They say both the Testimony of the Ancient, and of the Present Church. But how can the Testimony of the Ancient Church be known, but by the Writings of those that formerly lived, the Books of Fathers, and Decrees of Councils? But we would know how we shall have greater assurance that those Books were written by those Fathers whose Names they bear, and those Decrees made by those Councils to which they are ascribed, than that the Scripture is the Word of God? How came we to be more certain that *Cyprian's*, or *Austin's* Works were Writ by them, than that the four Gospels were Written by the four Evangelists, or *Pauls* Epistles by him? And if the Present Church prove its Authority by the Ancient Church, it must prove it but to very few; for they are but few that ever saw, and yet fewer that ever read the Writings of the Ancients, and many perhaps have never heard of them. And besides, the Ancient Church was sometime the Present Church, and when it was so, from whence might it prove its

its Authority? From some more Ancient no doubt, according to our Adversaries discourse, it must be. But from whence did the first Church prove its Authority (for we must come to a first) when there was none before it to prove it by? Lastly, the Authority of the Present Church cannot be proved by the Testimony of the Present Church: For then it must be either by a part of it, but that cannot be; for a part of the Present Church is inferior to the whole of it, and he that questions the Authority of the whole, will no less question that of a part; Or else, by the whole Church, and then the Authority of the whole Church must be proved by the Authority of the whole Church; we must believe She is the Church, because She says She is the Church.

Arg. 5. If we are to believe the Divinity of the Scripture, meerly on the Churches Authority, then that Faith can be but an humane Faith, because founded on no better than the Authority of Men: our Faith can be no better than its Foundation; a Divine Faith cannot be built upon humane Testimony; but the Papists themselves are ashamed to own a thing so grosly absurd, as that the Faith whereby we believe one main Article of Religion, the Divineness of the Scripture, should be but an humane Faith.

Excep. To this therefore they say, That the Faith whereby we believe the Scripture to be the Word of God is a Divine Faith, and built on the Testimony of God, and that Testimony is no other than the Testimony of the Church. We easily reply,

Deus per Ecclesiam loquens non aliter loquitur, quam si immediate per Visiones & somnia, aut quovis alio supernaturali modo revelandi, nobis loqueretur. *Staplet.*

Ans. 1. That the Churches Testimony is no otherwise the Testimony of God, than as it agrees with the Word of God; and when it doth so we are to believe what the Church says, not merely because the Church says it, but because God says it: And if the Church holds forth to me any Divine Truth, and I yield my assent to it, merely because the Church declares it to me; though what I believe be a Divine Truth, yet the Faith with which I receive it will be but an humane Faith; the Truth is *of God*, but my Faith is *in Man*; Whereas if I believe any Truth because God speaks it, though not by the Church nor any Officer of it, but some private Person, yet my Faith is a Divine Faith, and the Testimony of a private person speaking what the Scripture speaks, is as really the voice of God as the Testimony of the Church.

2. Some of the most Learned of the Papists themselves make a great difference between the Testimony of God, and of the Church; the former they grant to be *altogether* Divine, the latter *modo quodam*, after a sort Divine; the former they reckon to be the *primary* Foundation of Faith, the latter but the *secondary*; nay some of them acknowledg that Faith which rests only on the Authority of the Church, not to be Divine; and some the Churches Testimony to be but the *conditio sine qua non*, the condition without which we cannot believe the Divinity of the Scriptures, which sure they would scarce do if they thought the Testimony of the Church to be the Testimony of God: And if the Testimony

Bellarm. Becan. apud *Rob. Baron. Melchior. Can.* l. 2. c. 8.

mony of the Church be but in *some sort* a Divine Testimony, the Faith which is built upon it can be but in *some sort* a Divine Faith: and if the Testimony of the Church be but the *secondary* Foundation of Faith, How comes it to be (according to *Stapleton*) the Testimony of God himself, which sure they will allow to be the *primary* Foundation of Faith?

3. Before they can evince the Testimony of the Church to be the Testimony of God, they must first prove the Church to be absolutely Infallible, and see they agree among themselves about it, lest we be still at a loss how to know what is that Church whose Testimony is the voyce of God himself.

And 4. If I do but deny the Testimony of the Church to be the Testimony of God (as we do) how will they prove it? By the Testimony of the Church; I shall not take its word. Or will they say it hath such Notes of its being the Voice of God in it, as thereby to manifest it self to be his Voice? They will get nothing by that, for I am ready to say the same of the Scripture. Or, Lastly, Will they prove it by the Scripture? Then they plainly give away their Cause, and own the Authority of the Scripture to be before the Testimony of the Church.

Arg. 6. If we must believe the Scripture to be the Word of God, only because the Church determines it to be so, then we must believe all things in it to be of God for the same reason only: That *Christ came into the world to save sinners*, that *whoever believeth in him, shall have Everlasting Life*, &c. and all the Promises of the Gospel must be believed to be made to us by God, only because the Church tells us they were, and the Truth of them, *as to us*, depends meerly on the Churches Authority, and so all the comfort of our hearts, and the hopes we have of Heaven must be primarily derived from the Authority of the Church, and ultimately resolved into it: What a case had we been in if it had not pleased the Church to receive these Promises into the Canon? and if the Papists say true, she might not have received them; for (as we shall see by and by) it depends wholly upon the Church what Books shall be Canonical, and what not, and by the same reason what parts of those Books; and consequently, whether all the Promises of the Gospel shall be Canonical or not; and so we ow all our *Hope* to the Churches *Charity*, and must count her a good-natur'd Mother for not cutting off these *Breasts of Consolation*, but leaving something for her poor Children to hang upon, to keep them from perishing. Belike it is the Churches favour that all the World is not damned. I am sure the best Promises in the Scripture, if the Popish Doctrine take place, can afford but cold comfort. For if I be asked, What ground I have for my Hopes of Salvation? I answer the Promises of God. If I be asked again, Are these Promises true? I answer, Yes. But how doth that appear? Why, because God made them. But how do I know God made them? Well enough; for the Church says he did. Here the Authority of the Church is the first Foundation of all my Hopes: And poor ones, God knows, they

1 Tim. 1. 15. John 3. 16.

See the Papists Objections.

they are, if no better grounded, and little comfort I am like to have in them. It is to little purpose to tell me, the Testimony of the Church is not *meerly* Humane; for is it meerly Divine! If it be not, it cannot found a Faith which is meerly Divine: And when my Soul, and the everlasting Salvation of it, lies at stake, I think I am concerned to see that my Faith and Hopes have a sure Foundation; and that I am sure none can be which is not meerly Divine.

Arg. 7. If the Testimony of the Church is necessary, and the only sufficient Reason of our believing the Divineness of the Scripture, then it will certainly follow, that no man who is out of the Church, can be called into the Church by the Scripture; Which is pretty strange Doctrine, and yet I see not how possibly the Papists can evade it; for they that are called into the Church by the Scripture are perswaded by the Scripture, and convinced by it that it is their duty to joyn themselves to the Church: But this can never be if the Scripture be of no Authority with them; whatever convinceth or perswades a man must certainly have some Authority with him; and if therefore the Church perswades men by the Scripture, that Scripure must needs be received, and own'd ere they be joined to the Church; the Scripture being the very Reason and Argument whereby they are perswaded. The Conclusion will not be yielded to if the *Medium* from whence it is infer'd be not first granted; and in this case the Scripture is the *Medium* the Church makes use of in perswading men to embrace her Society. Thus it was in the beginning of the Gospel-Church, *Acts* 2. *Peter* disproves the conceit some of the *Jews* had of him, and the rest of the Apostles, that they *were full of new Wine*, by the Testimony of Scripture, *Joel* 2. 28. Prophecying concerning the pouring out of the Holy Ghost in the latter days. Then he proves the Resurrection of Christ, by *Psal.* 16. 8, *&c.* And his Ascension into Heaven, by *Psal.* 110. 1. And his being the Christ promised to *David* to be of the fruit of his Loins, by *Psal.* 132. 11. And hereupon follows the bringing into the Church three thousand of the Hearers, who *When they heard these things, were pricked in their hearts*, Act. 2. 32. And so *ch.* 3. How often doth *Peter* cite the Prophets, particularly, *Moses* v. 22.? And *Philip* thus Preacheth to the Eunuch out of the Prophet *Isaiah*, *ch.* 8. And *Peter* again to *Cornelius* out of the Prophets, *ch.* 10. 43. And *Paul Act.* 13. where we find some both Jews and Gentiles wrought on by his Preaching, and brought into the Church. And was it the Authority of these Apostles, that is, in the Papists stile, the Church, that perswaded thus many? Alas, they that heard them did not once dream of their being the Church, and therefore did not believe on that account.

Vid. Cham. Panstrat. de Can. l. 6. 18.

Arg. 8. No Law receives its Authority of binding Men to subjection to it, from those that are merely subject to it, and did not make it; therefore the Scripture hath not its Authority from the Church, which is merely subject to it as a Law, and is not the Author of it.

The

The whole Church is so, and not only Pastors but People; and if the Pope himself be not under the Scripture, as the Law by which he is to be ruled, well may he pass for ὁ ἄνομος, that wicked, or *lawless* One spoken of 2 *Thess.* 2. 8. True indeed, a Law may be made known by an Herald that proclaims it, but Who can say it receives its Authority of binding the Subjects from him, when he himself is one of them, and as much bound to it, as any else? Allow the Church to be the Herald which Proclaims and Publisheth this Law, Must She therefore give Authority to it? Put case, a Subject hear of a Law though not by an Herald, Is he not bound to submit to it, because he did not hear it proclaimed? Suppose a Man come to the knowledg of the Scripture, some other way than by the Ministery of the Church, in the Popish sence, that is, the Pastors of it, as it is storied the *Indians*, and the *Iberians* did by the help of private Persons, Is he not bound to submit to it? Must he suspend his Belief till he have the Testimony of the Church to assure him that the Scripture is of God?

"If it be said, that a Law doth not bind till it be promulged, and "the promulgation of it is the Churches business. I Answer; God hath published his Law sufficiently in the Scripture, and to it all must be subject to whom the Scripture comes, whether the Church further tells them that it is the Word of God or not; as in the case mentioned it was received and submitted to. I wonder how the Church was the Herald that proclaimed the Law of God to the *Iberians*, when they received it from a poor captive Woman. *Stapleton* (before) tells us, That when *Paul* preached to the *Thessalonians* his voice was the voice of the Church; And I pray was this poor Womans voice the voice of the Church too? By my consent let her even be the Church it self, *virtual*, *infallible*, a meer *Pope Joan* the first. But further, if the Church publish this Law we speak of, and it doth not bind till published by her, Upon what account did she her self believe it when she first published it? (Let the Question be concerning the Herald himself why he believes the Law which himself proclaims?) Doth the Church believe the Scripture to be the Word of God at all antecedently to her own publishing and propounding it to others, or not? Is her Faith wrought in her by the Testimony she her self gives to the Scripture, or by something before? I suppose the Papists will scarce be so mad as to say the former; For what kind of Faith must that be, when a man believes meerly upon his own Testimony? And how can the Church be the Church before she believes? If they say, the Churches Faith in the Scripture was wrought in her before her own Testimony concerning its Divineness, I would fain know what that is by which it is wrought? If it be any thing in the Word it self, or be the Testimony of the Spirit, Why may not I, or any man else believe the Scripture before the Church give in her Testimony concerning it, upon the same account that she her self doth? But if she believe the Divinity of the Scripture upon the Testimony

mony of the former Church, I would know again, What better assurance she hath of the Testimony of the former Church, than of the Scripture it self, seeing she can know it only out of the Writings of the Ancients? and whoever questions the Authority of the Scripture, may upon much better grounds question the Writings of Fathers, and Decrees of Councils, as was said before.

Arg. 9. They that believe not the Scripture to be the Word of God, when propounded to them as such, though they have not the Testimony of the Church to confirm them in it, yet Sin in their not believing it, and are therefore bound to believe it, antecedently to the Church's Testimony (for if they were not bound to believe it, they should not Sin in disbelieving it) and consequently the Scripture hath its Authority in it self, and before the Testimony of the Church; and therefore not from it. That Men Sin in not believing the Scripture even without the Churches Testimony, is proved from *Act.* 13. 46, 51. where *Paul* shakes off the Dust of his Feet against the Unbelieving Jews, and tells them they *Judg themselves unworthy of Eternal Life.* See *Act.* 28. 24. *&c.* where he declares their actual Unbelief to be the effect of their hard-heartedness; which though it might be judicial, they being left of God to themselves and their own Lusts, yet withal it was sinful too, and contracted by themselves. And will any Man say, That these Jews in refusing the Gospel did not Sin? I suppose the Papists themselves scarce will. If they say, as formerly, That *Pauls* Testimony was the Testimony of the Church; I answer, Those Jews own'd no such thing as a Gospel-Church, nor any Authority it had to bind them to the Belief of the Gospel; and consequently could not own *Paul* as an Officer of that Church, his Apostleship being merely a Gospel-Office, which Man could not submit to who did not first receive the Gospel by which he was constituted an Apostle. If they say, they might know him to be an Apostle by the Miracles he wrought; I answer again, That *Act.* 13. when he Preached at *Antioch in Pisidia*, we have no mention of any Miracle he there wrought, yet some both Jews and Gentiles believed, *v.* 42, 43. And therefore they neither received himself nor his Preaching upon the account of his Miracles, nor could Miracles make it the Duty of the unbelieving Jews to submit to *Paul* as an Officer of the Gospel-Church when no Miracle was wrought by him. If it be said that he was known by the fame of his Miracles elsewhere wrought which gave credit to him; Then it will follow, that *Paul* was to be believed for his Miracles sake, as well as the Gospel for his sake; and thence again, That the Gospel was not to be believed merely for *Pauls* own Authority, but principally for his Miracles, it being for their sake that he himself was owned as having any Authority; and if so, Either *Pauls* Authority was not the Authority of the Church, or the Authority of *Paul* as the Church was not Supream, for that of his Miracles was above it: That which procured credit to him was of greater Authority

than himself. Upon the whole it seems by this reply of the Papists that Miracles were the great thing which procured credit to *Pauls* Preaching; and if they did, the Authority of the Church did not, unless, as before they made *Paul* and the Church the same, so here they will make Miracles and the Church the same.

Arg. 10 It cannot be certainly known by the Testimony of the Church, that the Scripture is the Word of God, and therefore it hath not, as *to us*, its Authority from the Church. If it may be certainly known that the Scripture is the Word of God, by the Testimony of the Church, then, Either it must be by the Testimony of the Universality of Believers, or of the Pastors; not the former, for (beside that the Papists themselves exclude them, and say that the Scripture is to have Authority *with* them, but not *from* them) Either we speak of the Multitude of Believers separately and disjunctively, and so they cannot give credit to the Scripture, when they are all of them fallible and liable to Error: Or else all together and in conjunction; but so likewise they cannot certifie us of the Divineness of the Scripture, because they never did, never will meet together to do it; and we may stay long enough ere we believe the Divinity of the Scripture, if we tarry till all the Believers in the World meet together to give in their Verdict concerning it. If we speak of the Church merely in the Popish sence, for the Pastors of it, there will be as much uncertainty as in the other; for either we must consider them separately too, or in conjunction; if separately, they are all liable to Error, and according to the Papists themselves they do all believe the Scripture on the Authority of the Church, and therefore cannot give Authority to it; if we consider them all together, when *did*, or when *will* the Pastors of all the Churches in the World meet together to give their joynt Testimony to the Scripture? And if they should, Why are we bound to believe them? They were not infallible singly, nor can they be any more so conjunctly, if all the several parts of the integral, the Church, be liable to Error or Corruption, Why is not the whole? But suppose the Pastors meet by their Delegates in a General Council, Will that mend the Matter? Not at all that I see; for it is not yet determined by the Papists themselves, where the Supream Authority, which should give Testimony to the Scripture, doth reside, whether in Pope, Council, or both; and so we are left at uncertainties, and know not to whom to go, whose word to take, but must suspend our belief of the Divineness of the Scripture, till it be agreed upon among our Adversaries, whose Authority is indeed Supream and to be relied upon. Yet put case a General Council be the chief which gives Testimony to the Scripture; How shall we know that this Council hath not Err'd in determining the Scripture to be the Word of God? Shall we know it by the Scripture? It is supposed we doubt concerning that, and so its Testimony is not valid; Or by the Testimony of the Church? Why, this Council is the Church it self, which

Vid. Thes. Salmur.

which determines in its own Caſe, and ſo we muſt believe this Council hath not Err'd, becauſe it ſays it hath not Err'd. If the Pope be the Church *virtual*, and we muſt receive the Scripture on his credit, the ſame Objection will be againſt him, for How ſhall we know he doth not Err? By the Scripture? But it is yet in Queſtion; Or by the Teſtimony of the Church? The Pope himſelf is this Church, and then we muſt believe he hath not Erred, only becauſe he ſaith he hath not Erred. Laſtly, Let Pope and Council both together be this Church, How ſhall we know they both together do not Err? Not by the Scripture, for that is not yet own'd; nor by the Teſtimony of the Church, for Pope and Council together are this Church, and their Teſtimony concerning themſelves is not to be received. And to conclude, How ſhall we know that Pope and Council are the Church? Not becauſe they themſelves ſay ſo, nor becauſe the Scripture doth, for that is not yet believed; not by the Teſtimony of the Spirit, for Why ſhall that bear witneſs any more to the Church, that it is the Church, than to the Scripture, that it is the Word of God? Nor yet by Notes or Marks inherent in the Church, for, Why may not the ſame be allowed to the Scripture? And how ſhall we know theſe marks to be true, but by the Scripture, by which alone we can judg of the nature, and properties of the Church? And yet ſtill it is ſuppoſed that the Scripture is not believed.

4. This may ſuffice to ſhew the abſurdity of the Popiſh Doctrine, let us in the next place ſee what grounds they have for it, and how they oppoſe the Truth: I ſhall only ſpeak to the chief of their Arguments, and reduce them to as few Heads as well as I can; any that would ſee them more largely handled, may conſult ſeveral of our Proteſtant Divines, who ſpeak more fully to this Point, than the ſhortneſs of a Sermon will permit.

Obj. "Either (ſay they) the Authority of the Scripture muſt be known "by the Church, or by the Scripture it ſelf, or by the Teſtimony of the "Spirit; but it cannot be known either of the two latter ways; and there- "fore can only the firſt. Firſt, That it cannot be known by the Scrip- "ture it ſelf, they prove, becauſe neither the whole Scripture can be "proved by the whole, nor one part of it by another. For if a man "deny the whole Scripture it will be in vain to attempt the proof of "one part by another, when ſuch a one doth no more receive the Autho- "rity of one part than of another: And the whole cannot be proved "by the whole; for then the ſame thing ſhould be proved by it ſelf; "and whereas that which is brought to prove another thing ſhould it "ſelf be more clear than that which it is to prove, in this caſe one ob- "ſcure thing ſhould prove another; or rather an obſcure thing be "brought to prove it ſelf, for the whole Scripture cannot be ſaid to be "more clear, or better known than it ſelf. Before I propound the other part of their proof, I ſhall anſwer to this.

Anſ. The Divine Authority of the Scripture may be known by the Scripture it ſelf. For, 1. The Authority of one part of it may be proved by another part to thoſe that do not deny the whole. Some there have been, and ſtill may be, who have received ſome part of the Scriptures, and not others; to ſuch we may prove that part which they deny, by that which they all. The *Sadducees* acknowledged the Five Books of *Moſes*, but not the Prophets; our Saviour Chriſt therefore when he had to do with them, did not cite the Propheſie of *Daniel* to prove the Reſurrection of the Dead, but *Moſes* Writings, *Mat.* 22. But when he dealt with others of the *Jews* who received the whole Old Teſtament, he proved what he ſpake out of other parts of it, out of the Prophets themſelves; and ſo bids them more generally ſearch the Scripture. Why may not we do likewiſe? We ſhall ſee how the Old and New Teſtament prove each other, ſo that we may argue with men that acknowledg the one, ſo as by that they allow, to prove that which they deny.

1. The Old Teſtament is proved by the New, *Luk.* 24. 44. Chriſt divides the whole Old Teſtament into *Moſes, the Prophets and the Pſalms*, and thereby declares them all to be Canonical; that was then the uſual way by which the *Jews* did divide the Old Teſtament. And here in the Text, *Abraham* ſends *Dives*'s Brethren to *Moſes* and the Prophets. And *Joh.* 10. 34, 35. Chriſt mentioning a place out of the *Pſalms*, bears witneſs to the whole Old Teſtament under the name of the Scripture, *The Scripture cannot be broken.* And we find particular parts of the Old Teſtament proved in the New, *Mat.* 5. Chriſt confirms the Law of *Moſes* as to its Divine Authority, when he explains it, beſide other places in which he ſpeaks of ſome particular Laws, *Mat.* 12. 42. and *Luk.* 4. 26. and eſpecially *Heb.* 11. the Hiſtorical part of the Scripture is confirmed; and how many Teſtimonies have we out of the Pſalms and Prophets every where, which do the ſame. The twelve leſſer Prophets are at once proved by *Stevens* alledging them, *Act.* 7. 42. where the Teſtimony cited is out of *Amos*; but *Steven* mentions the *Book of the Prophets*, *i.e.* That Volume of the ſmaller Prophets which among the *Jews* was reckoned as one Book.

2. The New Teſtament is confirmed by the Old. For how often doth Chriſt and his Apoſtles prove their Doctrine out of the Old Teſtament? when they quote the Old Teſtament, it is a good proof of its Authority to any that own the New; and when by thoſe Quotations they prove their own Doctrine, it is a good Argument for the proof of the New Teſtament, to them that believe the Old, as the caſe was of the *Jews* at that time; and therefore our Saviour Chriſt refers them to the Old Teſtament, particularly *Moſes*, *Joh.* 5. 45, 46. for the proof of the great Doctrine he held forth to them, *That he was the Meſſiah* that ſhould come into the World. So *Peter*, *Act.* 3. refers to *Deut.* 18. to prove what he was preaching, *A Prophet ſhall the Lord your God raiſe up to you, &c.* The ſame we may ſay of the Types of the Old Teſtament, that they confirm

firm the New, in which we find them fulfilled. If any say, We find no particular confirmation of *Ezra*, *Nehemiah*, and *Esther*, in the New Testament: I answer, They are confirmed by our Saviour Christ in his general Division of the Old Testament, according to the *Jewish* account, into *the Law*, *the Prophets*, *and the Psalms*, under which these Books were contained; the whole Volume of the *Hagiographa* going under the name of the *Psalms*.

2. But now, what if we have to do with those that deny the whole Scripture, admit no part of it, How shall we convince them that it is the Word of God? I answer,

1. Not by the Church, be sure; for if they have no reverence for any part of the Scripture, they will have as little for the Church, which hath no being as a Church, but from the Scripture; and therefore it will be a most vain thing to attempt a proof of the Scripture, either in part, or in the whole, by the Church, which is as unknown in the nature of a Church, to them that question the Scripture, as the Scripture it self is.

2. We would prove the whole Scripture by the whole, as well as one part of it by another. For as the whole systeme of Gods Works in the Creation proves it self to be of God, and to have him for its Author, *Psal.* 19. 1, *&c.* by all those eminent signs and effects of Gods Goodness, Power and Wisdom which are to be seen in the whole: So likewise doth the whole Scripture prove God to be the Author of it, by all those signs and evidences of his Wisdom, Goodness, Power and Holiness which appear in the whole, and manifest it to be of God. Nor doth it follow from hence, That if the whole Scripture prove it self, it is, as the Papists say, more known than it self, *simply and absolutely*, though *in some respects*, it certainly may be so, as a man in one respect may be more known than himself in another: A man when he hath given some eminent proofs of his Learning, is thereby more known than without them he is; so the Scripture too considered with all those Evidences of Gods Goodness, Wisdom, Holiness, *&c.* which appear in it, is more known than it self when these are not considered. How do we prove the Sun to be the Sun but by the glory of its light, which so far excels the light of other Stars? and is not the Sun considered with its light more known to us than considered in it self? How do we come to the knowledg of the nature of things in the World, but by considering their Properties, Qualities, Effects, *&c.* which plainly declare what their nature is; seeing such Properties, *&c.* could not be but where such a nature is? So likewise here, there are those Properties in the Scripture, those Excellencies which could be from none but God, and therefore make it appear that that Writing which hath those Excellencies in it is of God. To speak of these distinctly is not my present business, not having to do with them that deny the Scripture.

2. "We cannot (say the Papists again) know the Scripture to be the "Word of God, by the Testimony of the Spirit; for either it is by the "publick Testimony, which is that of the Church, and if this be gran-

"ted,

" ted, they have enough; or its private Teſtimony, but then (they ſay) " it will follow; 1. That our Faith in the Scripture is Enthuſiaſm. " 2. That if the private Teſtimony of the Spirit be queſtioned, it cannot " be proved but by the Scripture; and ſo the Scripture being proved " by the Spirit, and the Spirit again by the Scripture, we ſhall run in a " round, which is no lawful way of arguing.

Anſ. To this I anſwer; That we know the Scripture to be of God by the publick Teſtimony of the Spirit, but I deny his publick Teſtimony to be his witneſſing by the Church; it is indeed his witneſſing by the Scripture it ſelf when he witneſſeth it to be of God, by thoſe Excellencies of it which evidence it ſo to be; and this he witneſſeth to all that have their eyes open to ſee it, and in that reſpect it may be called publick; and when he witneſſeth the ſame thing by the ſame means, in the hearts of particular Believers, and ſo applys his publick Teſtimony to private Conſciences, enlightning and enabling men to believe upon his publick Teſtimony; you may if you pleaſe call that his private Teſtimony. This clearly cuts off all that the adverſaries object, and no ſuch things will follow, as they pretend, upon what we maintain. We know no other private Teſtimony of the Spirit, but this particular application of his publick one; and then I am ſure there is no danger of Enthuſiaſm. For that is properly Enthuſiaſm when God reveals any thing to mens minds immediately and in an extraordinary way, and without the intervention of the uſual means whereby he is wont to make himſelf known to men, as in former times he did to the Patriarchs, Prophets and Apoſtles, (and the Enthuſiaſm both the Papiſts and we find fault with is, when men pretend to this which yet they have not:) But when God makes known his Will in an ordinary way, by the uſe of inſtruments, and means for the conveying of Spiritual knowledg to them, this is not Enthuſiaſm, as when *Faith comes by hearing*, Rom. 10. And ſo it is in the caſe before us; when the Spirit witneſſeth to the hearts of private Believers that the Scripture is the Word of God, he doth it in an ordinary way, working in them a Faith of the Scripture, by thoſe Arguments of Divinity, which are in the Scripture it ſelf, and makes uſe of them, as means to induce them to believe. As the light and brightneſs of the Sun is the *Medium* whereby it is known to be the Sun; ſo that Divine light and power which is in the Word, is the very *Medium* and Argument, whereby the Spirit (enabling us to perceive it) perſwades us that that Word is the Word of God. And I would ask our Adverſaries, Can a private man believe the Divinity of the Scripture meerly on the Authority of the Church, without the Spirits witneſſing it to him by that Authority? if they ſay, Yes, then they muſt acknowledg that Faith to be meerly humane becauſe not wrought by God; if they ſay, No, (as they muſt if they be conſtant to themſelves in holding that the Spirit witneſſeth by the Church), then when the Spirit witneſſeth to the Conſcience of a private Believer by the Church, why is not that Enthuſiaſm too? for when he wit-

witneſſeth to a private Conſcience by this application of his publick Teſtimony, here is as much a private Spirit, and a private Teſtimony as any we ſpeak of; the only difference is in the *Medium* the Spirit uſeth in this private work, which they ſay is the Teſtimony of the Church, and we ſay, is the Scripture it ſelf; both of us agree that it is the Spirits publick Teſtimony, but they call one thing ſo, and we another. If they ſay, That yet this is not Enthuſiaſm, becauſe here is no immediate Revelation, but means are made uſe of; I ſay the ſame of the Spirits witneſſing to the Divinity of the Scripture in the heart of a private Believer, by the Scripture it ſelf, or thoſe notes of Divinity which are apparent in the Word; this is no more immediate than the other, nor any leſs by the intervention of means.

And for the other Conſequent they would infer from the private Te- " ſtimony of the Spirit, that then we ſhall run in a round, and prove " the Scripture to be the Word of God by the Teſtimony of the Spirit, " and prove the Spirit again by the Scripture. There is as little fear of this as of the other: For we bring not the private Teſtimony of the Spirit in our Conſciences (againſt which only this Objection is made), or his applying his publick Teſtimony to us in a way of illumination and conviction of our minds, as the Argument inducing us to believe; but that we ſay, is his publick Teſtimony in the Word, when he witneſſeth its Divinity to us by that Excellency, Light and Power which is in the Word it ſelf, and makes uſe of that to perſwade us to believe. The Spirit indeed is the *Efficient* of our Faith, or the Agent which cauſeth us to believe, enlightning our minds, and drawing our hearts to conſent to the Truth; but the Evidences of Divinity we ſee in the Scripture, through the Spirits enlightning us, is the *reaſon or motive* of our believing; they move us to believe *objectively*, but the Spirit *effectively*. So that here is no danger of a Circle in our Diſcourſe, or proving *idem per idem*; for if I be asked, How I know the Scripture to be the Word of God? This queſtion may have a double ſenſe; for either it is meant of the *power and virtue whereby I believe*; and then I anſwer, By the Power and Efficiency of the Spirit of God opening the eyes of my Underſtanding, and enabling me to believe; or it is meant of the *Medium* or *Argument* made uſe of, and by which, *as a Motive*, I am drawn to believe; and then I anſwer; Thoſe impreſſions of Divinity the Spirit hath left on the Word, and by which he witneſſeth it to be of God, are the Argument or Motive perſwading me to believe. Now when they ask *how* I know the Spirit who witneſſeth in my Conſcience to the Divinity of the Scripture to be the Spirit of God? the Queſtion is plainly by what *Means or Argument* I am perſwaded that it is the Spirit of God, and then I anſwer by thoſe properties of the Spirit which the Scripture mentions. And ſo the Queſtion, How I know the Scripture to be the Word of God? either is concerning the *Efficient* of my belief of the Scripture, or elſe it is not to the purpoſe, (for I do not alledg the Efficiency

Vid. R. Baron. contra Turneb. Camer. de ver. Dei & Turretin. de Cr. Pontif.

ciency or inward operating of the Spirit, as the *motive* of my Faith), and the latter is concerning the *Objective cauſe*, or *Argument* inducing me to believe the Spirit to be the Spirit of God. The miſtake is this, They would faſten upon us, that we make the Spirit in his *inward* work upon our hearts to be the *motive* to our Faith, whereas we only make it to be the *Efficient* of our Faith.

To conclude this Anſwer to their firſt Argument: Let us ſee if it may not be retorted upon themſelves. If the Churches Teſtimony give Authority to the Scripture (as Papiſts ſay) then if a Man deny the Authority of the Church, How will they prove it? For neither one part of the Church can give credit to the other, when the whole is queſtioned, nor can the whole Church give credit to it Self, for then the whole Church will be more known than it Self. Or, if we ask, How comes the Church to believe the Scripture? Is it by its own Teſtimony? but ſure it muſt believe it ere it can give Teſtimony to it: Or is it by the Teſtimony of the Spirit? If ſo, is it by the Publick Teſtimony of the Spirit? That cannot be; for according to them, that is no other than the Teſtimony of the Church it Self, the abſurdity of which hath been already ſhewn. Or if it be the Private Teſtimony of the Spirit, then they by their own arguing, will run into Enthuſiaſm, as well as We. And indeed they do plainly run into a Circle in their proving the Scripture by the Authority of the Church, and the Authority of the Church again by the Scripture; for with them the Authority of the Church is the Motive or Argument whereby they prove the Divine Authority of the Scripture, and that again is the Motive or Argument by which they prove the Authority of the Church. And ſo both the Church and the Scripture are more known than each other, and yet leſs too; more known becauſe they prove each other, and leſs known becauſe they are proved by each other. Here they are themſelves in a nooz, but it is no matter; the Popes *Omnipotency* can eaſily break it, or the Churches Authority make her Logick Canonical, though all the *Ariſtotles* in the World ſhould make it Apocryphal.

Obj. 2. "It is neceſſary for us in Religion to have the Canon of "Scripture certain, but this we cannot have otherwiſe than by the "Church; becauſe its Authority is moſt certain, and the only one which "is ſufficient to remove all doubts concerning the Divineneſs of the "Scripture out of our minds; both becauſe God ſpeaks by the Church, "and becauſe the Church beſt knows the Scripture: She is Chriſts Bride, "and therefore beſt knows the voice of the Bridegroom; ſhe hath the "Spirit of Chriſt, and therefore can beſt judg of his Word, and the "ſtile of it.

Anſ. We deny that the Canon of the Scripture cannot be known but by the Church, and the Contrary hath been already proved: The Scripture hath been owned and received where no ſuch Judgment of the Church hath been. And it is as falſe that the Authority of the Church is the

the greateſt and moſt certain; for that of the Scripture upon which the Church and her Authority depends, is above it. God ſpeaks in the Scripture, and by it teacheth the Church her ſelf; and therefore his Authority in the Scripture is greater, the Authority of him that teacheth, than of thoſe by whom he teacheth. As the Authority of a King in his Laws, is greater than that of an Officer that proclaims them. A King may by his Counſel or Judges acquaint his Subjects with his Laws; But will it therefore follow, becauſe he ſpeaks his mind, which is in thoſe Laws, by ſuch Officers, that their Authority is greater than that of thoſe Laws themſelves? God ſpeaks by the Church (the true Church we mean) but he ſpeaks nothing by her but what he ſpeaks in the Scripture, which ſhe doth only Miniſterially declare to us; and therefore the Authority of God and his Law is above hers, who though ſhe publiſh yet did not make it, but is her ſelf ſubject to it, and by that Law only ſtands obliged to publiſh it to others. And for what they ſay of the Church's ability to judge of the Scripture; We anſwer, That She cannot judge of the Stile of the Scripture otherwiſe than by the help of the Spirit, and by the ſame private Chriſtians may judge too, and there be no means whereby the Church can know the Scripture to be the Word of God, but particular Believers may know it by the ſame: And if the Church's Authority be ſo great in our Adverſaries Opinion, becauſe She can ſo well judge of the Stile of the Scripture, How much greater is that of the Scripture, which is able by its Stile to manifeſt it Self to the Church?

Except. 'But (ſay they) we do not know the Voice of Chriſt in the 'Scripture, but by the Church; therefore her Authority is greater.

Anſ. This is both Falſe and Inconſequent. Falſe, for it hath been ſufficiently evinced that the Voice of Chriſt may be otherwiſe known, and hath been too. Inconſequent, in that it follows not that the Authority of the Church is therefore greater than that of the Scripture: *John Baptiſt* directed many to Chriſt, and ſuppoſe without his direction of them and witneſſing to Chriſt they had never come to him, Will it thence follow that *John's* Authority was greater than Chriſts? The Church, we grant may be a mean whereby many are brought to the Belief of the Scripture, who yet afterward do believe upon better grounds, as being perſwaded by the Word it Self.

Obj. 'We can no otherwiſe know the Scripture to be the Word of 'God, than as we know what Books are Canonical, and what not, 'what were written by Inſpired Pen-Men, and what were not; but 'this we can know only by the Authority of the Church. This is 'proved becauſe ſome Books which at firſt were not received as Cano-'nical, the Church did afterward receive, as *Eccleſiaſticus*, *Tobit*, *Su-'ſanna*, the Books of *Maccabees*, *&c.* The Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, the '*Second of Peter*, *Second and Third of John*, and the *Revelation*. And 'Books which are not Canonical, are therefore not Canonical becauſe

'the Church would not allow them as such; *viz.* The *Revelation of* '*Paul*, *the Gospel of Peter*, *Thomas*, *Matthias*, *&c.* And lastly, Some 'Books written by Prophets and Apostles are not Canonical, because 'the Church hath not determined that they are so.

Camero. *Anſ.* To let pass what a Learned Protestant largely proves, *viz.* That it is possible to know the Scripture to be the Word of God, and yet not know which Books are particularly Canonical, and written by Inspired Pen-Men; that it may be known that the Doctrine contained in those Books is of God, though it be not known whether it were writ by such as were immediately Inspired themselves, or had it from those that were. In the Primitive Times some not only Good Men, but Churches too, did deny some of those Books to be Canonical which we now generally receive, and yet they did receive the Word of God, and the Doctrine contained in those Books, though they questioned whether those Books themselves were written by such as were immediately Inspired or not. And do not the Papists themselves tell us, That the Canon of the Scripture was not established for a long time after the Apostles days, till it might be done by General Councils? And yet sure the Church did in the mean time own the Word of God, and know the Voice of Christ.

We say then that it may be known which Books are Canonical and which are not, otherwise than by the Church, for the Church her Self knows them otherwise than by her Self, or Her own Authority. When She declares them to be Canonical, She believes them to be Canonical, and her believing them to be Canonical is Antecedent to Her declaring them to be so; She must learn Her Self, before She can Teach Others: She believes them therefore to be Canonical, because She sees the Stamp of God upon them, and that they are such as can be of none but God. (The same way likewise private Believers may know them.) And when the Church sees this Stamp of God upon a Book, She thence concludes it to be Divine, and then declares it to be so.

Excep. 'But how then comes it to pass, That some Books of Cano-'nical Scripture were not so soon received as others, if all have such an 'Impress of Divinity upon them?

Anſ. I answer; That these Notes of Divinity, which are sufficient in all the several Books of Scripture to demonstrate them to be of God, yet may be more clear and illustrious in some than in others, as Gods Power and Wisdom may be more apparent, and conspicuous in some of His Works than in others of them: Or else it may be from the different degrees of illumination, afforded to different Persons, and in different Ages: When some doubted of some Books of Scripture, all did not, and they that did not, had a greater measure of the Spirit, as to that at least, than others had.

Now to their particular Proofs of the *Minor* Propositon in their Arguments, We Answer particularly. 1. That

1. That those Books annex'd by the Papists to the Old Testament, and called by them *Deuterocanical*, and by us no better still than *Apocryphal*; such as the Books of *Maccabees*, *Esdras*, *Tobit*, &c. never were received into the Canon by the Ancient Church, nor can they produce the Decree of any one Ancient Council wherein they were owned; as for Modern Councils we matter them not. They say that these Books were doubted of at first, and afterward received. Belike then the Church at first did not know them to be the Word of God; and if she be the Bride of Christ, who best of all knows the Bridegrooms Voice, How came she for so long time not to know it? Here certainly, in spight of *Infallibility*, the Church must be in an Errour; for if she doubted of the Divinity of these Books, when yet they were really Divine, she err'd in so doubting; and if she did know them to be of God, and yet did not receive them, she was more than erroneous, that is, she was plainly rebellious. As for the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, *the second of Peter*, and those others which we all own as Canonical, though some particular Persons or Churches might doubt of their Authentickness, yet it doth not appear that all ever did. Some of the Papists themselves confess that the Epistle to the *Hebrews* was generally acknowledged, unless by two or three of the *Latin* Fathers; and *Hierom* reckons both that, and the *Revelation* as generally acknowledged for Canonical. However when these Books were owned as Canonical, it was not on the bare Authority of the Church; For how came the Church her self to acknowledg them? How came she to know that they were written by Inspiration? Did she believe it on her own credit? Or did she not rather receive them as Canonical, because she found them Canonical, perceiving the stamp of God upon them? and sure the same reason might make us receive them, though the Church had not testified concerning them.

Speaking of both; *Et tamen Nos utramq; suscipimus, nequaquam hujus temporis consuetudinem, sed veterum Scriptorum Authoritatem sequentes, qui plerunq; utriusq; utuntur Testimoniis, non ut interdum de Apocryphis facere solent, &c.* Epist. ad Darden.

2. To the second Thing they alledg, concerning the *Revelation of Paul*, the *Gospel of Peter*, &c. or any Book written by Philosophers, or by Hereticks; I answer, That if the Church did reject them, she did do but her duty, and it will not follow from her rejecting them, that there was no other way of knowing them not to be Canonical, beside the Churches disowning them. For upon what grounds did the Church disown them? Upon her own Authority? Then she rejected them because she rejected them, judged them not be Canonical because she judged them not to be Canonical. If she did disown them because she saw not that Dignity and Excellency in them, which she saw in the Books of the Old and New Testament, and which might perswade that they were of God; sure then it was not meerly the Churches Authority which made them not to be Canonical; and on the same grounds that the Church rejected those Books, we likewise may do it. Sure I am *Eusebius* reckons those Books not only as *forged*, but as something worse, that is, *absurd* and *impious*.

Ὅθεν δὴ ἐν νόθοις ἀυτὰ καταλέξον, ἀλλ' ὡς ἄλοπα πάντη καὶ δυσσεβῆ παραιτητέον. lib. 1. c. 25.

3. "When they say that some Writings of the Prophets and Apostles "themselves are not Canonical, and therefore not so, because not ac- "knowledged by the Church to be so. I *Answ.* That some things the Prophets and Apostles might write as private Men, and not by the Inspiration and special direction of the Holy Ghost, and such never were to be received into the Canon of the Scripture, nor were written with any intent that they should. But those things which they writ as Prophets, and as Apostles, by the immediate Inspiration and special direction of the Spirit; and for this end, that they might be the Rule of the Saints Faith, were all received into the Canon: If they deny this, Let them produce any such Writing of Prophets, or Apostles not yet received as Canonical. For what they say out of 1 *Chron.* 29. 29. of the Writings of *Samuel, Nathan* & *Gad*, How will they ever make it evident that they were other than the Books of *Samuel*, written partly by himself while he lived, and partly by *Gad* and *Nathan* after his death? And so likewise, 2 *Chron.* 9. 29. the Writing of *Nathan*, *Ahijah* and *Iddo*, and 2 *Chron.* 13. 22. *Iddo* again, 2. 29, 30. *Jehu*, How will they ever prove them to be other than what we have in the Books of *Kings?* It is true too, that mention is made of some Writings of *Solomon* which are not in the Canon; But how will it appear that they ever ought to be there, or were ever written for that purpose? As for any Writings of the Apostles which are not in the Scripture, the chief insisted on is the Epistles, as they would have it, of *Paul* to the *Laodiceans*, mentioned *Colos.* 4. which we deny to have been written by *Paul*, nor will the words enforce any such thing; the Epistle *from Laodicea* is one thing, and *to Laodicea* another: It is most likely to have been some Letter written by the *Laodiceans* to *Paul*, in which there being some things that concerned the *Colossians*, the Apostle adviseth them to read that Epistle. *Hierom* saith of this Epistle, that some do read it as one of *Pauls*, but *it is generally rejected.* And for other Books which they mention, they have been as generally disowned by the Church as fictitious, and not written by the Authors whose Names they bear. The same Father cashiers several of them together, that went under the Name of *Peter*, as being all *Apocryphal.*

It is in the Greek, Ἐκ Λαοδικείας not πρὸς Λαοδικείαν.

Ἰ ἀεὶ πάντων ἐκβαλλεται, de Script. Eccles.

Ὡς ἀπόκρυφα ὄντα ἀποδοκιμάζεται. Ibid.

Obj. 4. "We cannot confute Hereticks who deny the Scripture or "part of it, but by the Authority of the Catholick Church, which re- "ceives it.

Answ. Those Hercticks that will acknowledg the Church may be confuted by its Authority, but not have Faith wrought in them; they may have their mouths stop'd, but not their minds enlightned by it. And though we may make use of the Authority of the Church with such, yet not as the chief, and much less only, Argument to perswade them of the Divinity of the Scripture; but even by the same way, whereby Believers are perswaded of it, may Hereticks be perswaded too. And if we meet with such Hereticks as pay no more reverence to the Church, than to the Scripture, we are in a fine case, if we have no other way of

of dealing with them, but by urging the Authority of the Church: ſurely they that deny the Divinity of the One, will not ſtick to deride the Teſtimony of the Other.

Obj. 5. To paſs by other Teſtimonies they cite out of the Ancients, one they mainly triumph in, that ſaying of *Auſtin*, "That *he had not* "*believed the Goſpel, had not the authority of the Church moved him to it.*

Ego non crederem Evangelio, niſi me Eccleſiæ Catholicæ commoveret Authoritas. Crederem & commoveret *for* credidiſſem, & commoviſſet, *as is a frequent way of ſpeaking with that Father.* See *Cham. Panſtr.* l. 2. c. 11. at large.

Anſw. Auſtin ſpeaks when converted and Orthodox, of himſelf as formerly a *Manichee*, and ſhews that he had then been moved by the Authority of the Church to receive the Goſpel: when he was a *Manichee* he was an Heretick, not an Heathen, and ſo might have ſome eſteem for the Church; or if he had no reſpect for the Church as the Church, yet he might (even by the Confeſſion of Papiſts themſelves) ſo far as he ſaw the Conſent of ſo many Nations, and the Preſcription of ſo long time, and other like Arguments in the Church to induce him to reverence it.

Uſe 1. From what hath been ſpoken we may conclude; 1. The miſchief and danger of Popery as to this particular Doctrine; How diſhonourable and injurious to God is this Doctrine of the Papiſts, and how deſtructive to Religion?

1. How diſhonourable to God, for the Credit of his Word to depend upon the Teſtimony of Men, and not to be able of it ſelf to diſcover its Author?

1. A diſhonour it is to his Wiſdom, if he could not otherwiſe aſſure Men of the Divine Original of the Scripture, than by having Men bear witneſs to it: If he knew no other way of certifying us of his Will, and making known his Laws to us, but by the help of our fellow-creatures, who as well as we are ſubject to thoſe Laws. Can God make the Heavens declare his glory, and cannot he make the Scripture do it? Can he make himſelf *known by the judgments he executes*, and not by the Statutes he eſtabliſheth? Can he ſhew forth his Wiſdom, Power and Goodneſs by the things he doth, and not by the things he ſpeaks, and ſo make his *Works praiſe* him, but not his Word? Nay, Can Men ſo write, ſo ſpeak, as thereby to diſcover themſelves, and what wiſdom, or knowledg, or skill they have, and cannot God do as much? Is God leſs wiſe and able than they are, or is he wiſe in ſome things, and not in others? How came the *Spirit of the Lord* to be thus *ſtraitned*, as to have but this one way of making known the Word to us, and that ſuch a one as he muſt be beholden to his Creatures for it? It is certain that formerly he had other ways, And why hath he not now? How comes he to be leſs wiſe than he was! Sure if there be no *variableneſs* in God, nor *ſhadow of turning*, he muſt be as unchangeable in his Wiſdom as in any other Attribute, and there can be no diminution of it.

Pſal. 9. 16.

Pſal. 145. 10.

Mic. 2. 7.

Jam. 1. 17.

2. If God can otherwiſe make known the Divineneſs of his Word, than by the Teſtimony of the Church, and yet will not, it looks (to ſay no worſe) very like a reflection upon his Goodneſs, to leave men

a more uncertain way of coming to the knowledg of his Will, and their Duty, when he could give them a more ſure one; to leave his people better helps againſt their weakneſs and doubtings, than the uncertain Authority of a Man, or a company of Men, who may as eaſily be deceived in the Teſtimony they give, as others may in the Faith they yield to it. And if God did formerly give his people a better and more ſure Foundation for their Faith, than the Authority of meer men, weak men, fallible men (as hath been proved), How comes his Goodneſs to fail now, and to be leſs to Saints under the Goſpel, than to thoſe under the Law, or the Patriarchs before it?

3. This Doctrine of the *Romaniſts* greatly derogates from Gods Sovereignty, it degrades his Authority, and lifts up the Church into his place; it doth worſe than make *Princes* go on foot, and *Servants ride on* Eccleſ. 10. 7. *Horſes*. If what the Papiſts teach in this Point be true, the Holy Ghoſt is in a worſe condition than his Apoſtle was, 2 *Cor.* 3. 1. (who needed not *Letters of Commendation to* or *from* the Churches) he muſt be fain to canvaſe for the Votes of *men*, or ſeek their Teſtimonials; God himſelf cannot eſtabliſh his Laws without the Churches leave; Jeſus Chriſt ſhall not be King of Saints, not ſway his Scepter, nor Rule his Houſe without the good-liking of the Pope and Council: What is this but what Tertul. was ſaid of old, *Niſi homini Deus placuerit, Deus non erit*; God muſt be concerned to pleaſe Men, at leaſt the Papiſts; for if he doth not, they know how to be quit with him; for then He ſhall not exerciſe his Authority over them, not bind their Conſciences, not command their Faith, not preſcribe them their Duty, not govern their Lives the Church will not give their approbation to his Laws, and ſo he ſhall not be their Sovereign, *he ſhall not be their God.* What can be more injurious to Gods Supremacy than this Doctrine, which ſubjects the Authority of God in his Word to the pleaſure of his Creatures? What Sovereign Prince upon Earth will endure to be ſo dealt with? to have the Authority of his Laws ſuſpended upon the Teſtimony of thoſe that publiſh them, of thoſe that are themſelves ſubject to them? I dare ſay the Pope ſcorns to have it ſaid that his Decretals have their force from him that divulgeth them, or his Bulls from him that Poſts them up: He would not endure if he ſent out his Orders to a Church, or Council, that they ſhould *fit* upon them, and ſubject them to their Judgment, and approve or diſallow of them as they ſaw fit; He would expect that they ſhould be received, and ſubmitted to upon the account of his Stamp upon them, and Seal annexed to them. Why may not the Scripture be allowed as much, which hath Gods Stamp ſo fairly impreſſed on it, and had the Seal of ſo many Miracles to confirm it?

2. This Doctrine of the Papiſts is prejudicial, indeed deſtructive to Chriſtian Religion, it leaves us only the name of Chriſtianity and no more. What is all Religion if God be not the Author of it, and if the Papiſts ſay true, we can never be ſure that God is the Author of that

that which we call Christian. This one Doctrine of the Romish Synagogue puts us into a worse condition than the Jewish one is in, which hath some Foundation for its Faith and Worship, whereas this leaves none at all for ours. It is in a word most perniciously contrary to, and destructive of a Christian Faith, and Comfort and Obedience all at once.

1. It is destructive to our Faith. It leaves us no firm Footing for it, when it must be *first* founded upon, and *lastly* resolved into the Authority of Men; and we can never know the Scripture to be the Word of God, without either the concurring Votes of all the Christian World to assure us of it, or at least the definitive Sentence of a Pope or Council, and have no better assurance of its being Divine, than their *say-so*. What can ruine our Faith if the undermining of it do not? And what is it to undermine it if this be not? It takes away the very Foundation of it, and instead of the infallible Veracity of the God of Truth, puts us off with the uncertain Testimony of (at least) a Company of Fallible Men, who may every one of them be deceived, and therefore so may we too, for Company, if we relie on their Authority. Indeed it leaves us little (if any at all) more certainty for our Religion than the Turks have for theirs; for Why may not they as well require us to believe that God speaks to us in the *Alcoran*, because they say He doth, as the Papists require us to believe He speaks to us in the Scripture, merely because *the Pope, or Council*, say so? Nay, How little difference doth this cursed Doctrine make between the Great Mysteries of the Gospel, the Articles of our Faith, and the ridiculous Fables of the Rabbines, or Abominations of *Mahomet*? For if some Writings are not Canonical Scripture, merely because the Church (that is, Pope or Council) hath not Canonized them, and some are because it hath; the *Acts of Peter* and the *Revelation of Paul* are not the Word of God, because the Church would not so far Dignifie them, and the *Epistles of Peter and Paul* are therefore of Divine Authority because it so seemed good to the Church to determine, Why might not the same Church, if She had been so pleased, have added the *Talmud* to the Scripture; and the *Alcoran* too? And they cannot say, it is because these Books contain not only innumerable Fopperies, but notorious Lies, unless they will eat their own Words, and recede from one of their chiefest Arguments, *viz.* That the Apocryphal Books they themselves do not receive, are therefore only not Canonical, because the Church hath not received them, when the rest are because She hath.

2. It is as destructive to our Comfort. When our great Comfort proceeds from our Faith, such as the one is, so will the other be too: an ill-grounded Faith can never produce a well-grounded Comfort: the Foundation being shaken, the Building must needs totter. What will become of that *Comfort of the Scripture* the Apostle speaks of, *Rom.* 15. 4. that *Joy and Peace in Believing*, v. 13. that *Hope in Gods Word David* mentions, *Psal.* 119. 81. and 130. 5. If we can no otherwise be

sure

ſure that it is Gods Word, but only becauſe *Men* tell us it is ſo? How will our Hope and Comfort fail us, and our Hearts fail us, when we come to conſider; That that Teſtimony of Man which is the ground of our Faith, and therefore of our Comfort, for ought we know will, ſure enough may, fail us? How ſhould we ſtand if our Foundation ſink under us? If *The Rain ſhould deſcend, and the Floods come, and the Winds blow, and beat* upon us, What Shelter, what Fence ſhould we have? *How great would our Fall be?* If Temptations ſhould ariſe, and aſſault and ſhake our Faith, How ſhould we maintain our Comforts? Would it not be ſad for Us, or any of Us to ſay within our Selves; 'I have ventured my Soul, and its Eternal Welfare upon the Scripture, 'and the Promiſes I there find, but How do I know that this Scripture 'is the Word of God? How do I know I am not miſtaken? Am I, as 'ſure I am not deceived, as I am certain of being Miſerable if I be? 'Here is indeed a Company of Men that call themſelves the Church; 'but that is a hard Word, I never meet it any-where but in their *mouths*, 'and in this *Book* which they have put into my Hands; and yet theſe are 'the only Men that tell Me it is the Word of God. But What reaſon have 'I to believe them? They ſay indeed they are *Infallible* and cannot be 'deceived, but How ſhall I know that? They ſay the Scripture ſays ſo; 'Suppoſe it doth, What know I but they make it ſay ſo, and the Scripture, and they are agreed together to gratifie one another, and ſpeak 'for one another? I ſee not that they are the Church unleſs the Scripture makes them ſo, and yet they tell me, that the Scripture is not the 'Word of God *to me* unleſs they make it ſo. I know no Authority 'they have to bind me to *believe them*, but what this Book gives them, 'and they know none it hath to bind me to *believe it*, but what they 'give it. And thus I am quite at a loſs, if either this thing called the 'Church be not honeſt but *will* cheat me, or be not infallible but *may* 'deceive me; How vain than, and flattering have all my Hopes been 'hitherto, how uncertain my Faith, how deceitful my Joys and Com-'forts! Farewel *Glory, and Honour, and Peace*; farewel *Life and Im-'mortality*; farewel the *Inheritance of the Saints*, and the *Crown of righ-'teouſneſs*; fine things if I knew where to have them. How would you like this Chriſtians? Do ye not even tremble at the thoughts of ſuch diſmal Temptations? What think you then of the Religion of the Papiſts, which expoſeth all that embrace it to ſuch uncertainties; It is no wonder they allow no *certainty of Salvation* to Believers, when they leave them at ſo great *uncertainties* for the very Foundation of their Faith.

Matth. 7.

Rom 2. 10. 2 Tim. 1. 10. Coloſſ. 1. 12. 2 Tim. 4. 8.

3. It is as deſtructive to our Obedience as to either of the other. Goſpel-evidence is the fruit of Faith; and therefore ſuch as is the Faith we have, ſuch will be the Obedience we yield: If our Faith be not right, our Obedience can be no better: a humane Faith is not ſufficient to found our Duty to God upon, and that Obedience which proceeds only

only from such a Faith, will neither be acceptable to God, nor available to us; and yet such is the Faith, and no higher which causeth our Obedience, if it be grounded only or firstly in the Testimony of Man, and resolved into it. *Without Faith it is impossible to please God*; and that Faith sure is a Divine Faith, such as rests on Gods own Authority: But if we believe the Scripture to be of God, only because Men say it is, that Faith cannot be Divine; and therefore nor the Obedience which flows from it acceptable. In this case the same Testimony of the Church which would be the Foundation of our Faith, would likewise be the cause of our Obedience: We should believe Duty to be Duty, with the same kind of Faith with which we believed the Command of it to be of God, and that would be no other than mens telling us that it is; and so the result of all would be, that we must obey God, because they tell us he commands us to obey him, and so we first shew a respect to Men in believing before we shew any to God in obeying him; And then, not only we must be beholden to the Church for the knowledg we have of our Duty, but God must be beholden to her too for our performing of it.

2. How much a better Religion is ours than that of the Papists? We are the veriest fools upon Earth if ever we change our own for theirs.

1. We have more Certainty in our way than they have, or ever can have in their way. Our Faith is built upon no worse a bottom than the infinite Veracity of him who is the Truth it self, revealing himself to us in the *Scripture of Truth*, and not on the sandy Foundation of any Humane Testimony: It leans upon God, not upon men; upon *Thus saith the Lord*, not *Thus saith the Church*. Though we despise not the true Church, but pay reverence to all that Authority wherewith God hath vested it, yet we dare not set it up in Gods place; we are willing it should be an help to our Faith, but not the Foundation of it, and so should do its own Office, but not invade Gods Seat, nor take his Work out of his hands; that would neither be for his Glory, nor our own Security: Our Faith is a better than such a one would be: We receive it not from Churches, from Popes, from Councils, but from God himself, that cannot lye to us, and will not deceive us. If we are beholden to Men, Parents, Ministers, &c. for putting the Bible into our hands, and directing us to the Scripture; yet when we read it, hear it opened, and are enlightned by it, and see what a Spirit there is in it; When the Word *enters* into us (as the Sun-beams into a dark room) *and gives us light*, Psal. 119. 105. we see its Excellency, are ravished with its beauty, taste its Sweetness, feel its Power, admire its Majesty: When we find it to be such a Word as searcheth our Hearts, judgeth our thoughts, tells us all that is within us, *all that ever we did in our lives*, John 4. 29. awakens our Consciences, commands the most inward spiritual Obedience, sets before us the noblest Ends, and offers us the most glorious Reward, an unseen one, an Eternal one; Then we come to acknow-

ledg that *of a Truth God is in it*, no meer Creature could be the Author of it; and so we believe it, not because Men have Ministerially led us to the knowledg of it, or have perswaded, or commanded us to receive it, or told us it is of God, but because we our selves have heard, and felt him speaking in it; the Spirit shines into our minds, by the Light of this Word, and speaks loudly to our hearts, by the Power of it, and plainly tells whose Word it is; and so makes us yield to Gods Authority in it. Take a Christian whose Faith is thus bottomed, and overturn it if you can; you must first beat him out of his Senses, perswade him he hath no eyes, no taste, no feeling, no understanding, no affections, no reflection upon himself, no knowledg of what is done in his own soul, and so indeed that he is not a Man, but a brute or a stock, e're ever you can perswade him that the Scripture is not the Word of God. Whereas, on the other side, the Papists Religion is built meerly on Men, and their Faith hath no more Certainty than those Men have Infallibility. Ask them what is the great, nay the only convincing Reason, why they believe the Scripture to be the Word of God: And they will tell you, the Churches Testimony concerning it; they believe it because the Church commends it, that is, the Pope doth so, or a General Council, or some-body they know not who; and here they are at a loss already, for asmuch as they fill our ears with a great noise and din of the Church, and can scarce talk of any thing but *the Church*, *the Church*, yet they are not so much agreed among themselves, what this very Church is upon whose Authority they build their Faith, and would have us build ours; In several Countries they have several *Churches*, several *Supremacies*, several *Infallibleships*; A Council is the *Church*, and *Supreme*, and *Infallible* in *France*, and the Pope is the same in *Italy*, and so (amongst the Papists) if you do but change your *Climate*, you must change your *Faith* too; if you but Cross the *Alps*, you must translate your Faith, and shift it from a Councils shoulders, to the Popes: A strange variable thing you will find it, which must be calculated according to the *Meridian* you are in, and will not serve indifferently for all places; so that you must be sure to *fix* your habitation ere you can *settle* your Belief. And yet if this were agreed upon, you would still be at an uncertainty as to the Infallibility of whatsoever they call the Church; for you are like to have nothing but their own word for it; and if you will take it so, you may; or if they prove it by the Scripture, they desert their Cause, and own the Scripture as above them, and Authentick without them, and so while they would establish their Infallibility they lose their Authority. And so to conclude, there is nothing certain, nothing solid among them, nothing able to bear the weight of an Immortal Soul, nothing upon which a man can venture his Everlasting Salvation. I see no such thing as a truly Divine Faith among them, unless it be therefore *Divine*, because built upon the Authority of their *Lord God the Pope*. They call the Pope *Ecclesiæ Catholicæ Principem & Sponsum*; In the Mass at the Election

Election of him, they apply that to him which is said of the Holy Ghost, *John* 14. 16. *I will pray the Father, and he will send you another Comforter.* And in the time of *Leo* 10, It was disputed in their Schools, among other Blasphemies, Whether the Pope were a meer man, or *quasi Deus*, as it were a God; and Whether he did not partake of both the Natures of Christ. *Morn. Myster. Iniquit.* p. 636.

Our Religion is more Comfortable as well as more Certain. Our Faith being built upon the Truth of God himself, and our Comfort upon our Faith, so long as our Foundation remains immoveable, we need not fear our Superstructure. If our Faith have good footing, our Hopes and Comforts will keep their standing. Faith in the Promises is that from whence all the Comfort of our hearts, and our *rejoycing in hope of the glory of God* doth proceed; A Christians Joy is *joy in believing*, and his Peace the *peace of God*, and his comforts the comforts of the Holy Ghost; but this can never be if our Faith be founded immediately on the Testimony of Men, and not of God, or we believe the Promises of the Word to be made by God, because Men tell us he made them. So long as we hold to the *sure Word*, we have sure Hopes, and sure Comforts, and no longer; and therefore a Papist can never have any *strong consolation* by his Faith, when his Faith it self hath so *weak* a Foundation. How can they ever rejoice in hopes of Heaven, when they believe there is a Heaven with no better a Faith, than they believe a Pope or Council to be Infallible? It is to little purpose to say, They believe there is a Heaven (say the like of other Articles) because God in the Scripture tells them so, when they would not have believed one tittle of that very Scripture, if a Pope or a Council had not bid them believe it; for then their Hopes and Comforts are all resolved into the Authority of this Church (what-ever it be) as well as their Faith is; and both the one and the other rests not on the real Infallibility of the God of Truth, but on the pretended Infallibility of one single Prelate at *Rome*, or a Convention of them at *Trent*. From such a Foundation for our Faith, and such Comforters of our Consciences, *The Lord deliver us.* Rom. 5.

By this you may gather what you must do if you would be Papists; you must renounce your Reason, and Faith too, if you would embrace their Religion; you must enslave your Consciences to the Authority of Men, and so put out your own eyes that you may see with other Mens: you must not be built upon the Foundation of the *Apostles* and *Prophets*, but of *Popes* and *Councils*, it may be of a single Pope, and so hazard your eternal Peace and Welfare on the credit of a Man, who may be himself a Murderer, an Adulterer, a Sodomite, a Necromancer, a Blasphemer, an Heretick, and may be so far from being saved himself, that he may (as some Papists acknowledg) carry whole *cart-loads of Souls to Hell* with him; yet still he is *Infallible*, an *Infallible Murderer*, an *Infallible Sodomite*, an *Infallible Sorcerer*, &c. And you must believe

him to be Infallible all this while, by himself or with a Council, or you cannot be saved among them. The Church to be sure you must believe, and adore what-ever it be (either representative or virtual), you must not ask a Reason for your Faith neither, but tamely submit to its tyrannical Dictates. And, if it should ever come to this, Would it not be as *hard a Chapter*, as the *third of Daniel*? Would not *Smithfield* be as hot a Place as the Plain of *Dura*, if every one that would not fall down and worship this great Golden Idol, *Holy Church*, should be cast into the burning fiery Furnace.

Use 2. And therefore to prevent this, and That your Faith may be firm, and immoveable, as standing not in the Authority or Wisdom of Men, but the Power and Truth of God; That your Hearts may be full of Comfort, your Lives full of Holiness, your Deaths full of Sweetness, and That you may be more than Conquerors over all those Temptations whereby the Wicked one may at any time assault your Faith; Besure to see that it have a good Foundation; see that you believe the Scripture upon solid and lasting Grounds. Trust the Authority of no meer Man, nor Company of Men in the World, in a Business on which the Everlasting Blessedness, or Misery of your Souls doth depend. *Hear Moses and the Prophets*; hear the *Apostles and Evangelists*; We are sure God spake by them, and they never Err; as for Popes and Councils, we are sure they have Err'd, and so may do again, and so may your Parents that first Instructed you. Masters, Teachers, Churches, all may Err, and though *de facto* they do not Err in this, when they tell you the Scripture is the Word of God; yet they being but Men, and having no Promise of absolute Infallibility, and being liable to Mistakes in other things, when you find that, you may come to question whether they were not mistaken in this too, and so think you have been deluded all this while, and taken that for the Word of God, and Rule of your Lives, which is nothing less; and then you will either cast away your Faith, or you must seek a new Foundation for it; and if you come in a Papists way, and hear talk of *Peters* Successors, Christs Vicars, Catholick Churches, General Councils, Infallibilities, long Successions, Apostolical Traditions, you do not know what kind of Spirit such Conjuring Words may raise up in you: You may be apt to think, the Major Part (as you will be told, though falsely, it is) must carry it, and so determine your Faith by the Votes of Men, that is, not so much change the Foundation of it, as enlarge it: And whereas before it was built upon the Credit of a Parent, or a Pastor, now build it upon the Credit of a great Many, or a great One in the Name of all the rest; or if it rested before on a particular Church, now it shall relie on that which you are told is the Catholick one. For my part, I shall never wonder to see ill-grounded Protestants, easily turn Papists: they are semi-Papists already, and they may soon be wholly such; they have a Pope at home, and if they do not like him, they may easily exchange him

him for another abroad: He that pins his Faith upon one Mans Sleeve may soon do it upon anothers; he is already a Church-Papist, and may soon be a Mass-one. And therefore, to conclude, Whoever thou art, if thou have not formerly done it, Search thy self now ere Satan sift thee: try thy Faith in the Scripture that it may be approved; see whose Image and Superscription it bears, what Foundation it hath, what *Answer* thou canst give to any one that *asks* thee *a reason of it*, nay, what answer thou canst give thy self. Ask thy self, Why do I believe the Bible to be the Word of God? 'How do I know it was not the Inven-'tion of Man? By what Arguments, by what Authority was I indu-'duced to give my assent to it? Do I take it merely on the credit of 'those of whom I was born, among whom I was bred, with whom 'I have conversed? Is this a sufficient Foundation for my Faith? Dare 'I venture my Soul upon such a Bottom? Is this to build my House 'upon a Rock? How near the Papists am I come ere I was aware of it? 'I spit at them, and defie them, and yet act like them if not below 'them, and can scarce say so much for my Faith as they can for theirs. If this be thy condition, To work a-new for shame, and begin quickly too, and get thy Faith well settled, and upon its right *Basis*, or I dare say thou wilt never keep thy Faith at the expence of thy Life, but rather turn ten times than Burn once. If thou hast therefore any regard to the constancy of thy Faith, to the comfort of thy Life, the honour of God, or the Salvation of thy own Soul, labour immediately to get thy Belief of the Word better founded: Read the Scripture constantly, study it seriously, search it diligently, hear it explained, and applied by others, meditate on it thy self, and beg of God an understanding of it, and a right Faith in it; that he would give thee *an heart to perceive, and eyes to see, and ears to hear*; that he would *Open thine eyes to behold wondrous things out of his Law*; that he would give thee his Spirit, that thou mayst *Search the deep things of God*; that he would cause thee to hear his voice in that Word which thou hast hitherto taken to be His, and direct thy heart into the surest Grounds of believing it. And be sure hold on in such a way of painful endeavours for the getting thy Faith settled, till it be done, and what thou hast hitherto received on the account of Man, thou now believest for the sake of God himself. I deny thee not the Testimony of the Universal Church of Christ in all Ages (so far as thou art capable of knowing it) as well as of the present Church, or any particular One to which thou art any way related, as an help to thee; make the best thou canst of it, only rest not on it: But especially take notice, if thou see not the Stamp of God upon the Word, Characters of Divinity imprinted on it, as well as external Notes accompanying it; Consider the Antiquity of it, the Continuance of it, the Miracles that confirmed it, the condition of the Men that penn'd it, their Aims, their Carriage and Conversation, Gods Providence in keeping it, and handing it down to thee through so many successive Generations,

Deut. 29. 4. Psal. 119. 18.

1 Cor. 2. 10.

rations, when so many in all Ages would have bereaved the World of it: And further, Consider the Majesty and Gravity, and yet Plainness and Simplicity of its Stile, the Depth of the Mysteries it discovers, the Truth and Divineness of the Doctrine it teacheth, the Spirituality of the Duties it enjoyns, the Power and Force of the Arguments with which it perswades, the Eternity of the Rewards it promises, and the Punishments it threatens, the End and Scope of the whole, to reform the World, to discountenance and extirpate Wickedness, and promote Holiness and Righteousness, and thereby advance Gods Glory, and lead Man on to everlasting Blessedness, *&c.* And be sure leave not off, till thou find thy Faith raised from so low a bottom as the Authority of Men, and fix'd on Gods own Testimony; till thou canst safely and boldly say, 'I believe the Scripture now to be the Word of God, not 'because I have heard Men say so, but because I hear God himself in this 'very Scripture bearing witness to it; his Spirit hath given me new 'Eyes, and enabled me to see the Divineness of it: *I know and am sure* 'That this is the Word of God, never mere Man spake at such a rate, 'never did the Word of Man work such effects. The *entrance of it* hath '*given light* to my Soul which was before in darkness, not knowing whither it went. How many glorious Mysteries do I see in it, what Purity, what Spirituality, what Holiness, *&c.* all which speak the Wisdom, and Power, and Goodness, and Holiness, and Truth of the 'Author of it? What Sweetness have I tasted in it? It hath been as Psal. 19. 'the *Hony and hony-comb* to me: What Power, what Life, what strange 'Energy have I experienced in it? What a Change hath it wrought in 'me! What Lusts hath it discovered and mortified! What Duties hath it 'convinced me of, and engaged me in! What Strength hath it furnished 'me with! How hath it quickened me when I was dead in Sin, revived 'my Comforts when they were dying, actuated my Graces when they 'were languishing, rouzed me up when I was sluggish, awaked me 'when I was dreaming, refreshed me when I was sorrowful, supported 'me when I was sinking, answered my Doubts, conquered my Temptations, scattered my Fears, enlarged me with Desires, and filled me with 1 Pet. 1. 8. '*Joy unspeakable and full of glory*! And what Word could ever have 'wrought such effects, but that of the Eternal, all-Wise, all-Powerful 'God? And therefore upon his alone Authority I receive it, Him alone 'I adore in it, whose Power I have so often found working by it. I 'durst venture an hundred Souls if I had them, and an hundred Heavens if there were so many, upon the Truth and Divine Authority 'of this Word; and should not stick, not only to give the Lie to the Such Titles the Papists give their Schoolmen. 'most *Profound*, and most *Resolute*, and *Invincible*, and *Irrefragable*, 'and *Angelical* and *Seraphical* Doctors, nay and *Infallible* Popes, and 'Councils too, but even to say *Anathema* to Angels themselves, and 'Seraphims, if they should tell me the Scripture were not the Word 'of God. Christian, get but such a Faith of the Word as this into thy

Heart,

Heart, and then thou mayeſt defie Scoffers, Atheiſts, Papiſts, and all their Works. If they deride thee, let them mock on; thou wilt not eaſily be laughed out of thy Senſes, nor overcom by Mens Jeers to diſbelieve what thou haſt ſeen and felt. If they will not believe as thou doſt, yet thou ſhalt never be brought to play the Infidel as they do; no more than ceaſe to behold, and admire the glory of the Sun, becauſe Birds of the Night, Owls and Bats, care not for looking on it; thou wilt never deny what thou plainly ſeeſt, becauſe others do not who have no Eyes. Sure I am, if they ſee not what thou doſt, it is either becauſe they wink againſt the Light, or look off from it, or God hath not yet in Mercy opened their Eyes, or hath in Judgment cloſed them up; *If our Goſpel be hid, it is hid to them that are loſt.* 2 Cor. 4. 3.

SER-

SERMON XI.

Whether the good Works of Believers be Meritorious of Eternal Salvation? *Neg.*

Mr Edward Veal.

Psalm 62. 12. *Also to thee, O Lord, belongeth Mercy: for Thou rendrest to every man according to his work.*

THere is scarce any sin more natural to us than Pride, and no Pride worse than spiritual Pride; it was the condemnation of the Devil; and spiritual Pride shews it self most of all in those high and overweening thoughts we are apt to have of our own worth and excellency: Though when we have done evil we are filled with guilt, yet if we but think we have done well, we are tickled with conceit; one while we are conscious we have offended God, another while we are ready to believe we have obliged him. We can scarce be enlarged in a duty, pray with any life or warmth, hear with attention and affection, but we are ready to take our Lords words out of his mouth, and greet our selves with a *Well done good and faithful Servant.* And that too not only, as if the work were wholly our own, but as if we had deserved something by it. We commonly contend with the Papists about the Antiquity of our Religion; they bear us in hand that theirs is the more ancient; for my part, I readily grant it in this sense, that Popery, as to several of the chief points of it, is plainly the Religion of corrupt nature, and nature hath the start of grace in the best of us. Men are generally born with a Pope in their bellies, and they can never be eased of him, till some powerful conviction of the insufficiency of their own righteousness, and the impossibility of meriting Salvation by it, like strong Physick make them disgorge themselves, and bring him up: And if the doctrine of merits be in the Papists only, their Faith, yet it is in carnal Protestants, their Nature, and in Saints themselves, may sometimes be their temptation. And therefore, Christians, though my present business lie mainly with them of the Romish Religion; yet do not you look upon your selves as altogether unconcerned;

Mat. 25.

The most violent assault Mr. *Cnox* ever had from Satan was at his dying hour, when he was tempted to think that by his faithfulness in his Ministry, he had merited Heaven it self. *Vid. Melch. Adam. in vita Cnoxi.*

but remember that the same Arguments which conclude directly against the Pope without you, may at the same time be levelled against the Pope within you. And the truth of it is, that acquaintance with your selves, and the constitution of your own souls, is the best way to establish you against the most dangerous errours of Popery, and the better you can deal with that little young Antichrist in your hearts, the better you will be able to defend your selves against that great old one at *Rome*. And that I may help you so to do as God shall enable me, I have chosen this Text, which I the rather fix upon, because I find it in the head of a whole squadron of Scriptures, pressed by *Bellarmine* into the Popes service: his Holiness his Commission you know can compel any Scripture to maintain the Catholick Cause, though against its own consent. I shall endeavour in the progress of my discourse, to rescue both this, and others from the injury of an involuntary warfare, in which they are forced to fight against that truth, which God commissioned them to defend. If we look into the body of this Psalm, we shall find the royal Pen-man of it, once and again, declaring and professing his faith and confidence in God, and him only, *ver.* 1, 2, 5, 6, 7: in despight of all his enemies opposition against him, over whose power he doth triumphantly insult, *ver.* 3. as well as tax their malice, *ver.* 4. and perswades others to the like fixing their faith on God, *ver.* 8. labouring to take them off from their false and ill-grounded confidences, whether in persons or things, either as wicked or vain, *ver.* 9. 10. and then lays down the reasons and grounds of the boldness of his faith, Gods power, *ver.* 11. and his mercy, *ver.* 12. one shewing his sufficiency, and ability to overtop all those enemies, and effectually to save, the other his readiness so to do for all that do thus trust in him, and wait for him. The latter of these, Gods mercy, he sets forth by a most eminent instance of it, that most glorious retribution he makes to those that do believe and obey him. *Also to thee, O Lord, belongeth Mercy: for thou rendereſt to every man according to his work.*

And so the words do both assert that great Attribute of Mercy in God, and prove it; the one in the former part of the verse, *To thee, O Lord, belongeth Mercy*: the other in the latter, *for thou rendereſt to every man according to his work.* The great day of recompensing men according to what they have done in the flesh, will be the most ample proof, and illustrious manifestation not only of the righteous, but merciful nature of God.

Enquire we here what is meant by Work, and what by rewarding men according to it.

1. By Work we are not to understand barely one individual work; but (the singular number being put for the plural) a plurality, or complection of works, of the same kind, which altogether make up one integral work. All the particular actions men do of the same kind are but parts of the great work they are doing, either for God, or the

the Devil, and so are all included in it. And the miscarriages of Gods children, are so many haltings in their course, so many bunglings in their work, which are blemishes in it, though not absolute interruptions of it.

But if it be farther enquired, what kind of Work or Works is here intended? I answer, good ones, especially; for in the rewarding of them it is that Gods goodness and mercy so greatly appears, when it is plainly enough his justice that is manifested in the recompensing of evil ones. Or we may thus Paraphrase the words; To thee O Lord belongeth mercy, in that thou rendrest to every man according to his work, not only evil to them that do evil and have deserved it, but good to them that do good, though they cannot challenge it.

2. By rewarding men according to their works, (briefly, because I shall meet with it again) I understand Gods recompensing men according to the nature, or kind, or quality of their works: such as their works have been, such shall be their reward, Rom. 2. 6, 7, 8, 9. *Who will render to every man according to his deeds. To them who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory, and honour, and immortality, eternal life. But to them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath,* &c. And so the proportion is between the kind of work, and the kind of reward. Where the work was good the reward shall be sutable; and where the work was evil the reward will be answerable. Natural good the reward of Moral, as natural evil the reward of Moral evil, *Isa.* 3. 10, 11. If it be *well* with *the righteous* and *ill* with *the wicked*, who can say but the reward is according to their works, though the righteous mans reward be a thousand times greater than his work? Here is therefore a likeness of *quality* between the work and the reward, but not a proportion of *equality*.

Quia tu reddis unicuique juxta opera sua; bona bonis, mala malis: damnas peccatores, remuneras justos. Hierony. in Ps. 62. *qui apud illum est* 61.

Est igitur inter opera & præmia similitudo qualitatis, non proportio æqualitatis. Daven. *de justitia.* Act. C. 60.

Doctr. The truth then we infer from the words thus explained, is this, *That the reward of good works is not deserved by them that receive it*: Or, That the best of men by their best works, do not merit the reward that God gives them. If the consequence of this doctrine from the Text be questioned, it may thus be proved. That which is meerly out of the mercy of the rewarder, cannot be for the merit of the worker, Rom. 11. 6. *And if it be by grace, then is it no more of works, otherwise grace is no more grace: But if it be of works, then is it no more of grace, otherwise work is no more work.* But the Psalmist here affirms, that the reward of good works is out of the mercy of the rewarder: and therefore it follows, that it is not for the merit of the worker. And so I come to the business in hand, to shew you that good works do not merit eternal life, that being the reward spoken of by the Pen-man of this Psalm. Here we must,

1. Explain the terms of the Question.
2. Give you the State of it.

3. Confirm the Truth.
4. Take off Objections.
5. Make Application.

1: For explication of the terms, it would be enquired into,

1. What is meant by good works? *Answ.* Not to wrong our Adversaries, they themselves do generally understand such good works as are wrought by them that are furnished with truth of Grace, or a supernatural principle suted to, and productive of supernatural actings: such good works as are the vital actions of the new man, the motions of that *Divine nature* whereof believers are *made partakers*. And indeed those works which proceed not from such a principle can be but equivocally called good, as not partaking of the nature of that which is truly, *i. e.* supernaturally good: And of those only we are here to speak, and not of any such as are antecedent to the first grace, or conversion of the heart to God. But when we speak of these good works, we mean not only those of the second Table, works of justice, Charity, Bounty, though the Papists like them best, at least when done to themselves: they must needs be eminently good, which bring in good mony to the Popes coffers, and good chear to the Priests bellies: But we take them more largely and comprehensively, for the duties of both Tables, and those too not only external, or such as are performed by the outward man, but likewise for the inward actings of this supernatural principle which yet proceed no farther than the heart, such as the inward workings of love, thankfulness, hope, joy, humility, patience, *&c.* And in a word, all that good fruit of all kinds, which grows upon this good root.

Bellarm. requires to a meritorious work, that it proceed from one who is *Amicus et gratus Deo*, and then *ex charitatis virtute*. De Justific. l. 5. c. 10. Pet. 2. 1, 4.

This principle always accompanies Faith, without which no works are to be called good. *Et si bona videatur facere, tamen quia sine fide facit, nec bona sunt vocanda.* Aug. in Ps. 31.

2. What we are to understand by Meriting. What is the Original signification of the words *Mereri* and *Meritum* I shall not stand to enquire, but that which is most in use in our present age, and which the Papists for the advantage of their cause make most use of, is expressed in English by *deserving* and *desert*. But if we look back to former times, we shall find these words taken in a far different sense by the Ancient Fathers, (to say nothing of Heathen Writers) than by modern Papists. The Fathers commonly take *mereri*, to merit, for the same as *consequi*, *obtinere*, to obtain, or gain, and *meritum* merit; for any good work which according to Gods appointment is rewardable with eternal life: though in the other, and more strict acceptation of the word it be no merit, as not being truly worthy of the reward; and so to *merit* eternal life is in their sense no more than to do those things which are the way wherein eternal life is to be obtained. And this is evident in that they apply the word Merit to those actions in which any real desert, or proper worthiness of the reward, can never be rationally imagined. Thus *Augustin* frequently, one while he tells us that the Worshippers of Devils are said to *Merit* certain temporal comforts: Elsewhere, that the Virgin *Mary*

Cultores dæmonum dicuntur mereri temporalia quædam solatia. de Civit. Dei. l. 5. C. 24. *Maria concipere et parere meruit eum, quem constat nullum habu-*

merited

merited to Conceive, and bring forth Christ. And again, that *Paul* by so many persecutions and blasphemies, *merited* to be called a chosen vessel. And yet again that the people of *Israel* had a stiff neck, for that they merited to be delivered from their bondage by so many miracles. And I find a passage cited of *Austin*, which, if merit be taken in the present Popish notion, all the world cannot reconcile to sense. *Nullis præcedentibus meritis per gratiam dei meruimus templa dei fieri*, By no antecedent merits, we by the grace of God merited to become the Temples of God. And can a man *merit* without *merits*? deserve without deserts? If he have no merits properly so called, he cannot properly *merit* to become the Temple of God; but without *merits* he may obtain this favour of God. And yet more strange is that expression, whoever is the Author of it, which some tell us is still sung in the Roman Rituall, where speaking of *Adams* sin, it is said to be *Fœlix culpa quæ tantum meruit habere redemptorem*. An happy transgression which *merited* so great a Redeemer. And will any believe that *Adams* sin deserved so well at Gods hands? Was Christs coming into the World to redeem sinners, the reward of sin, or the remedy against it? and yet the reward of it, it must be, if the word *meriting* be taken in its proper sense. The same way the word is taken by others of the Fathers. *If they, i. e.* the Israelites (saith *Ambrose*) *did not merit to come into the land, because they murmured against God: How shall we merit to come into Heaven, when we live so like the Heathen?* And *Cyprian* speaking of *Dorcas* being raised from the dead, *she* (saith he) *who ministred help to the afflicted Widows that they might live, merited to be called back to life at the Prayers of Widows.* In the same Catachrestical way we sometimes find the word used in the vulgar translation, *Josh.* 11. 20. we read it, *That they might find no favour:* the vulgar hath it, *that they might not merit any mercy.* And Gen. 4. 13. *My punishment is greater than I can bear.* Our Margin reads it, *Mine iniquity is greater than that it may be forgiven*: but the vulgar, *Mine iniquity is greater than that I should merit forgiveness.* What can meriting in these places signifie, but obtaining a signification very far differing from that in which the Papists now take it? *Usus* is *norma loquendi*, Words are to be taken as they are used; and who knows not that words have their modes and fashions, as well as mens habits and manners? and so those which are in fashion in one age, are quite out in another, or taken quite in a different sense, and sometimes the Metaphorical signification of a word may be more in use than the proper; and we shall make strange confusion in the nature of *things*, if those words which properly signifie those things, be always taken in their proper sense. I insist the more in this, because it is all the Answer I intend to the Testimonies of the Fathers, which the Papists think to run us down with.

isse peccatum. de Nat. & Grat. c. 36. *qui (de Paulo loquitur) pro tot persecutionibus et blasphemiis, vas electionis meruit nominari.* de Predict. & grat. c. 16. *et paulo ante, dura cervix in illo populo qui ex omni Mundo electus est, qui de servitute decem miraculis meruit liberari.*

Chamier. & River. Orthod. Cathol.

Si illi terram intrare non meruerunt, qui murmurati sunt contra Deum, quomodo Nos Cœlum meremur intrare, indifferenter viventes, sicut Gentes. Amb. in 4. ad Hebr. *Quæ laboranti bus viduis largita fuerat subsidia vivendi, meruit ad vitam petitione viduarum revocari.* Cypr. de Op. & Eleemos. *Et non mererentur ullam clementiam. Major est iniquitas mea, quam ut veniam merear.*

But

But to pass from the word to the thing: if we enquire into the Pedigree of this darling doctrine of the Papists, we may easily derive it (to look no higher) from their Great-grand-fathers the Pharisaical Jews, from whom they have received a great part of their Religion: The Pharisees were for infallibility, and a Magisterial imposing spirit in matters of Conscience before the Pope was born; and the Rabbines were for Tradition before there were any Papists in the World: And as for Merits, *Camero* cites a passage out of *Maimonides*, where he says, *That every man hath his sins, and every man his Merits, and he that hath more Merits than sins, is a just man, but he that hath more sins than Merits is a wicked man.* And that learned Author, as well as others, is of opinion that the Apostle *James* hath an eye to this errour of the Pharisees, when he says, *Chap. 2. ver. 10. That whoever offends the Law in one point is guilty of all.*

צל-נה תורהשב
Vid. Buxt. Synag. Jud. & Petr. Galetine. l. 1. c. 1.
Camero in Matth. 19. 3. oper. 170.
Burgens. apud Drus.

Others tell us of seven sorts or degrees of Pharisees among the Jews, one of which had its name from their professing to do all still that was required of them, or asking, Was any more yet to be done? like the young man, Mat. 19. 20. *All these have I kept from my youth, what lack I yet?* And indeed we need go no farther than our Saviours frequent reflections upon them, and the Apostles smart disputations against them, in the point of justification. But from whence soever the Papists have received this doctrine of Merits, thus they mannage it: Merit, say they, is twofold, One out of *Congruity*, the other out of *Condignity*: The former is a work to which the reward is not due out of justice, but out of some kind of decency, or congruity; or as some of them speak, out of the liberality of the person who accepts the work; so that though the work do not really merit the reward, and is not proportioned to it, yet there is some kind of meetness or congruity that it should be rewarded. This kind of merit some of them contend to be found in men while in their natural state, in relation to that grace which is afterward bestowed on them, or wrought in them: But others of themselves do as stifly oppose it, and maintain that sinners cannot even in this way merit the first grace, nor the pardon of their sins, and that believers when fallen from grace (as they suppose they may) cannot merit their own recovery. But this is not the Merit we are to speak of; The other is that which is out of condignity, which *Durand* distinguisheth into two kinds: One taken more largely for a work of that dignity or goodness which is according to Gods appointment required in it, that it may be rewardable with eternal life; and that is no more really than the graciousness, or supernatural goodness of the Action, as proceeding from a supernatural principle, and ordered to a supernatural end, which we acknowledge must be in every good work which is capable of a supernatural reward, and is to be found in every truly gracious action. But there is a Merit

מה חובתי פרוש
Pharisæus qui dicit, quid debeo facere et faciam illud, q. d. *quid fieri oportet quod non feci?* Drus. de trib. Sect. Jud. l. 2. c. 22. & Hotting. Thesaur. l. 1. c. 1.
Luk. 18. 9. & 16. 15.
Rom. 10. 3.

Di. Alvar. de Auxil. disp. 59.
Franc. Cumel. in 1. 2. &. 1.
Thom. disp. 5. sect. 3.
In Sent. l. 2. dist. 27. q. 2.

Est actio voluntaria propter quam debetur alicui merces ex justitia, sic ut si non reddatur, ille ad quem pertinet reddere, injuste facit, et est simpliciter ac proprie injustus. Durand. ibid.

out

out of Condignity in a more strict sense, which is defined to be *A voluntary action for which a reward is due to a man out of Justice, so that it cannot be denyed him without injustice.* Others define it much after the same manner, *viz.* such an action as hath an equality of dignity or worth in relation to the reward, which is therefore due to it out of justice. And this is the merit we are to speak of, to say nothing of that third kind some add, Merit upon supposition of a promise, as when a reward is promised to a man if he do some work, which yet bears no proportion to that reward, and for which antecedently to the promise he could not challenge any, but such a promise being made, he may, and consequently (say they) may be said to Merit.

Meritum ex pacto.

The Question then is between us, and the Papists, *Whether the good works of believers, such as God doth reward in the future life, do truly and properly deserve that reward, so that it is due out of justice, and God should be unrighteous if he should deny, or refuse it?* The modern Papists generally affirm it. The council of *Trent* so lays down the judgment of the present Church of *Rome*, as to assert that good works do *truly merit eternal life*, and anathematize any that shall say the contrary.

2. The state of the Question.

Cum enim ille ipse Jesus Christus, tanquam caput in membra, et tanquam vites in palmites, in ipsos justificatos jugiter virtutem insleat, quæ virtus bona ipsorum opera semper antecedit, comitatur et subsequitur, et sine qua nullo pacto Deo grata et meritoria esse possent, nihil amplius ipsis justificatis deesse credendum est, quo minus plene illis quidam operibus quæ in Deo facta sunt, divinæ legi, pro hujus vitæ statu, satisfeciisse, et vitam æternam suo etiam tempore, si tamen in gratia decesserint, consequendam, vere promeruisse *censeantur.* Sess. 6. Cap. 16. *Si quis dixerit hominis justificati bona opera ita esse dona Dei ut non sint etiam bona ipsius justificati merita, aut ipsum justificatum bonis operibus & non vere mereri augmentum gratiæ vitam æternam,* &c. Anathema sit. Can. 32.

And though those cunning Fathers speak somewhat darkly, and so involve things, blending truth with error, as if they designed to make younger brothers of all the World beside, yet the great interpreter of Counsel speaks more honestly, that is more broadly, and plainly tells us, *That eternal blessedness is no less due to the good works of good men, than eternal torments are to the evil works of wicked men.* And that *eternal life is so the recompence of good works, that it is not so much given of God freely, and out of Liberality, as it is out of debt*: And that *the nature of Merit and grace not being consistent, the reward is to be reckoned, not as of grace but of debt.* Now well fare *Andradius* for a plain dealing Enemy; it is a commendable quality in any, but a rare one in a Papist; the man saves us the labour of guessing at the Councils meaning, had all spoke out like him, we should more easily have understood them, and fewer would have been deluded by them: And yet not to wrong any, other modern Jesuits are no less rigid in the point than this Author; nay who among the Papists do not assert the worthiness of good works in relation to the reward, though they are not yet agreed from whence

Andred. apud Chamnit.

that

that worthineſs ſhould ariſe: Some ſay as (*Bellarmine* tells us) from the promiſe of God engaging to reward them; but theſe are few, and too modeſt, and inded half Hereticks for their pains. Others ſay from the intrinſick worth, and excellency of the works themſelves, ſetting aſide the conſideration of the promiſe. Theſe are the impudent chi'dren of Holy Church, fit Sons for ſuch a Mother. And yet the Cardinal himſelf comes little behind them, if at all; he is of opinion, that the good works of righteous men are worthy of Eternal glory, partly by reaſon of their own proper goodneſs, and partly by virtue of Gods promiſe; yet *not ſo* neither (for he is afraid of ſpeaking too diminutively of good works) *as if without Gods covenanting with the worker, and acceptance of the work, it did not it ſelf bear an anſwerable proportion to eternal life; but* (only) *becauſe, ſetting aſide the promiſe, God is not obliged to accept a good work to eternal life, though it be equal to it.* To theſe we may add others, who ſay good works are worthy of eternal life, as they are *tincta ſanguine Chriſti*, dip'd in Chriſts blood, dignified and commended by his merits, from which they receive virtue and power, to be themſelves meritorious. And ſo our buſineſs is to ſhew that good works do not on any account, either of themſelves, and their own internal excellency, or of Gods promiſe, or Chriſts Merits deſerve eternal life. And ſo we came to confirm the truth.

Ratio meriti complete eſt ex ordinatione voluntatis divinæ illius actus ad præmium. Srot. in Sentext. e. 1. dict. 17. & paulo poſt.

Actu voluntatis ſuæ (Deus) ordinando ipſum (actum humanum) ad præmium, voluit ipſum eſſe meritum, qui ſecundum ſe conſideratus abſque tali acceptatione divina, ſecundum ſtrictam juſtitiam non fuiſſet dignus tali præmio.

Opera juſtorum ſunt meritoria vitæ eternæ de condigna ratione patti, et operis ſimul non quidam quod ſine pacto vel acceptatione non habeat opus bonum proportionem ad vitam eternam. Sed quia non tenetur Deus acceptare ad illam mercedem opus bonum, quamvis par et æquale mercedi, niſi converſio intercedat. Bellarm. de juſtif. l. 5. c 1°.

Vid. Catech. Rom. p. 412.

Arg. 1. Good works are rewarded meerly out of Gods mercy and grace, and therefore not out of mans merit. What more oppoſit than Mercy, and Merit? Tit. 3. 5. *Not by works of righteouſneſs, but of his mercy he ſaved us.* What a man doth really deſerve by his works, cannot be ſaid to be given him out of meer mercy and grace. But it is from thence only that the beſt works of Gods children are ever rewarded with eternal bleſſedneſs. Thus the Text, *To thee, O Lord, belongeth mercy, for thou rendereſt to every man according to his work.* Were not God infinite in mercy, the beſt Saint upon earth would fall ſhort of a reward in heaven. Jude 21. *Looking for the Mercy of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt unto Eternal life.* 1 Pet. 1. 13. *Hope to the end for the grace that is to be brought unto you at the revelation of Jeſus Chriſt.* And *Paul* prays for *Oneſiphorus*, 2 Tim. 1. 18. *That he might find mercy of the Lord in that day*, the great day of retribution. The reward then that theſe Saints expected, and would have others look for, is one given them out

Inter mercedem et meritum eſt quidam reſpectus mutuus &c. utramque autem habet quandam oppoſitionem ad gratiam ſive donum gratuitam. Janſen. Iprens. de grat. primi hominis. c. 6.

Εἰ δὲ ὀνησιφόρος ὁ κινδύνους ἑαυτὸν παραβάλλων διὰ χριστὸν ἀπὸ ἐλέους σώζηται, πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἡμεῖς.

Εἰ μὴ ἐλέῳ ἡ φιλανθρωπία ἦλθοι κρῖναι, ἀλλ' ἀκριβῆ ποιήσαιτο τὴν ἐξέτασιν, πάντας ὑπευθύνους εὑρήσει πάντως. Chryſoſt. in Pſal. 130.

of

of Mercy. Men never need mercy more than when they come before Gods Tribunal, and even there when they look for the reward of their good works, they must expect it from the mercy of the Judge. So *Nehemiah* did, who after making mention of some of his good works, and praying that God would remember him for them, chap. 13. ver. 14. he farther prayes that God would *spare him according to the greatness of his mercy*, ver. 22. Now when is it that *Nehemiah* desires to be spared, but then when he expects his works should be rewarded? Gods sparing extends even to his judging. Gods remembring him for good, *ver.* 31. his not wiping out his good deeds, and his sparing him, all proceed from the same mercy of God. But eternal life (say the Papists) is ascribed to Gods mercy, not that it is not truly, and properly the reward of mans Merits, but that those merits themselves are the fruits of Gods mercy. To which we may easily reply, that if God do out of his mercy save us, and out of mercy remember us for good, and reward us according to our work, then it is clear that he doth not only enable us out of his mercy, to do those good works which tend to Salvation. It is one thing for a man to be saved, another thing to be put into a way of Salvation by being enabled to work for it. As it is one thing to crown a man for conquering, and another to give him weapons & teach him to fight. God could not be truly said to save any man, if he only gave him grace to work in order to it: Nor to save him out of mercy, if for all that mercy he must still be saved by his merits, and without them, might fall short of Salvation.

Exc.

Answ.

Neque servatus (est) ex misericordia, cui tam sint post eam misericordiam necessaria merita, ut possit illa absque his fieri irrita. Cham. Panch. l. 14. c. 14. To. 3.

Arg. 2. Eternal life is the gift of God, and therefore is not deserved by our good works, Luk. 12. 32, *It is your Fathers good pleasure to give you the Kingdom.* Rom. 6. 23, *The wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life.* That therefore Eternal life is a gift none can deny, that will not deny the plain words of Scripture: And that then it will follow, that good works do not deserve it, will appear by the opposition that there is between a free gift, and a due reward: that which is of grace is not of debt, and that which is of debt is not of grace, *Rom.* 11. 6. What I owe, I cannot be said properly to give, and what I properly give, I cannot be said to owe. So that if God properly gives Eternal life, he cannot be said to owe it, and if he do not owe it, I am sure we do not deserve it. So much we see in the Apostles Antithesis, the wages of sin is death; death is truly and properly the wages of sin, as being deserved by us, and it is justice in God to give us our desert. But he doth not say, Eternal life is the wages of our righteousness or works, but the gift of God, as being free, and altogether undeserved by us. Ὀψώνια, *Stipendium*, he alludes to the *pay* that was given to Souldiers in the Wars, and for which they had served. *Luk.* 3. 14.

ἐυδόκησε.

Stipendium peccati mors. Recte stipendium, quia debetur, quia digne retribuitur, quia merito redditur deinde ne justitia humana de humano se extolleret bono merito, &c. non e contrario retulit, stipendium justitiæ vita æterna, sed Dei gratia vita æterna. Aug contra Pelag. Epist. 105.

Malluit dicere gratia Dei vita æterna, ut intelligeremus, non pro meritis nostris Deum nos ad vitam æternam, sed pro sua miseratione perducere. Aug. de grat. & lib. Arb.

Be content with your wages ἀρκεῖσθε τοῖς ὀψωνίοις ὑμῶν. But Eternal life he calls χάρισμα the free gift of God, such an one as is given, ἐκ χρέους out of grace, as Souldiers sometimes were wont to have gifts, *donativa* largesses, given them over and above their pay, as we know was the frequent practice of the Roman Emperours to do, unto which it is not unlikely that our Apostle may allude in the latter part of the verse, as well as he plainly enough doth to their pay in the former. *The Apostle doth not say eternal life is your wages* (says Theophylact) *but Gods gift, for you receive not the compensation, and remuneration of your labours, but all these things come by grace through Jesus Christ.*

Luk. 7. 42. When they had nothing to pay he frankly forgave them both. ἐχαρίσατο.

οὐκ εἶπεν ἡ ἀντιμισθία ἡ παρὰ τῶν θεὸν ἀλλὰ τὸ χάρισμα, ὃ χῶν ἀμοιβὴν καὶ ἀντίδοσιν πόνων ἐλάβετε, ἀλλὰ χάριτι τοῦτα πάντα ἐγένετο σὺν χριστῷ ἰησοῦ. In Sext. c. 2d Rom.

Arg. 3. Eternal life is given to believers by way of Inheritance, and therefore not by way of Merit, Eph. 1. 14, *Which is the earnest of our inheritance.* Rom. 8. 17, *If children, then heirs, heirs of God, and joynt heirs with Christ.* Heb. 1. 14. *Who shall be heirs of Salvation.* This none can deny. And that it follows that if they be heirs of glory, they have it not by the merit of their works, we see by Tit. 3. 5, 7. *Not by works of righteousness*, &c. *that being justified by his grace we should be made heirs*, &c. Gal. 3. 18. *If the inheritance be of the Law it is no more of promise, but God gave it to Abraham by promise.* To have eternal life by the Law and by works, is opposed to our having it by promise, and by inheritance. And this may be farther confirmed; for if a believer merit his inheritance, then either he doth it by works done before his Adoption, which Papists themselves will not say, who acknowledge eternal life not to be the wages of servants, but the portion of children, and that merits cannot be in any who are not reconciled to God, and accepted of him: Or else it must be by works done after a man is adopted; but that cannot be neither, because whoever merits, doth thereby acquire a right to something to which he had none before, whereas every believer hath a right to the heavenly inheritance by his very Adoption, and before those good works be wrought, whereby it is pretended he merits it. Rom. 8. 17. *If children, then heirs*, &c. But say the Papists, believers have a right to heaven by their adoption, yet must merit the actual possession of it. It is subtilly distinguished: as if an adopted person had not a title to the possession of the inheritance the very first moment he is adopted, or as if a man might have a right to heaven, and yet not have a right to the possession of it. We acknowledge that obedience is required in a Son before he come to possess his Inheritance, yet that obedience though antecedent to his possessing that inheritance, is only the way in which he is to come to it, and the means whereby he is to be fitted for it, but is not meritorious of it; there is no right to the Inheritance required by his obedience which before he had not, though farther fitness for, and suitableness to it there may be. The Israelites were to fight, and subdue their enemies ere they possessed the promised Land, but their right to the possession of it they had before by the promise; and who can say that they were worthy of it meerly because they fought for it?

Exc.

Answ.

Arg. 4.

Arg. 4. Believers owe all to God, and therefore can merit nothing of him: they owe all to God, both as being his servants to whom they are bound, and his beneficiaries who have received all from him.

1. They are his servants, Luk. 17. 10. *Say we are unprofitable servants.* 1 Cor. 6. 19, 20. *Ye are not your own, for ye are bought with a price*; what that price is *Peter* tells us, 1 *Pet.* 1. 18, 19. not corruptible things, gold, silver, but *the precious blood of Christ*, &c. All the Creatures are his servants, because made, and employed, and maintained by him: but believers are more especially his servants, because they are redeemed by him too, from being servants to sin and Satan (by whom, though they were never rightfully Servants, yet they were held in bondage) and purchased by him to be his own possession, his peculiar people, and to do his work, to be *zealous of good works*, Tit. 2. 14. I suppose none can deny Believers to be as much Gods servants, as any mans servants are his, and that he hath as absolute a dominion over them, as men ever can have over those which are theirs, being bought with a price as well as any. Now who knows not that servants are so their Masters, that they are not their own, not *sui juris*, cannot command themselves, not dispose of themselves, or their time, or their work; all they have, and all they do is their Masters. Believers then being thus Gods servants have nothing, do nothing but what belongs to their Lord, and so can deserve nothing at his hands by all the service they can do him, seeing they owe it all to him; who indeed deserves any thing for doing what he is bound to do, and deserves punishment if he do not do? And therefore if God rewards his servants, he doth it out of his liberality, and because it pleaseth him to reward them, not that any thing is due to them; and if he never should reward them, never had promised them a reward, yet still they being servants were bound to do his work. Hence our Saviour in that 17. of *Luk.* bids his Disciples when they have *done all that is commanded them*, or supposing they could and should do all, yet even then to acknowledge themselves to be but *unprofitable servants*, not only unprofitable to God, (so much the Papists will grant) but unprofitable to themselves, in that being bound by the condition of servants to obey their Lord, they could not deserve so much as *thanks*, *ver.* 9, much less a reward. And so in a word, if God give believers any thing it is grace, if nothing it is not injustice. He that would deserve any thing of his Master must first be made free; Manumission must go before Merit.

περιποιησις Eph. 1. 14.

2. Believers owe all to God because they are his beneficiaries, and have received all from God, 1 Cor. 4. 7. *What hast thou that thou hast not received? It is God that worketh in you to will, and to do of his own good pleasure.* Phil. 2. 13. *Not that we are sufficient of our selves, to think any thing as of our selves, but our sufficiency is of God.* 2 Cor. 2. 5. And indeed Papists themselves dare not in plain terms deny

it, but in words confeſs it. And the more ancient, and ſounder Schoolmen roundly aſſert, all the good we do, as well as enjoy to come from God. *No man*, ſays one, *is before-hand with God in doing any thing for God, but God himſelf in every good work, and motion is the firſt mover and doer.* And, *whatever we are* (ſaith another) *whatever we have, whether good actions, or good habits, or the uſe of them, it is all in us out of the liberality of God freely giving all, and preſerving all.* And yet another, *All our good works and merits are Gods free gifts.* He calls them merits, and yet in that very place diſputes againſt the condignity of merits, with this very Argument we have in hand. And though it be true, that the good actions we do are ours as they are wrought by us, and come from us, yet all that is good in them is of God, and they have no more goodneſs in them than what they have of him.

Nullus autem homo prius fecit pro Deo, ipſe enim Deus in qualibet motione et factione eſt primus motor et factor. Bradw. de cauſa Dei. p. 343.

Et illud quod ſumus, et quod habemus, ſive ſint actus boni, ſive habitus, ſeu uſus, totum eſt in nobis ex liberalitate divina, gratis dante, et conſervante. Durand. in Sent. l. 1. diſt. 27. q. 2.

Omnes operationes noſtræ et merita ſunt dona Dei. Gregor. Arimin. in Sent. l. 1. diſtinct. 17. q. 1. Art. 2.

Totum quod eſt hominis bonum eſt a Deo Aquin. ſum. 1. 2. q. 114. Art. 1.

Now then hence it will follow that men can deſerve nothing of God, Rom. 11. 35. *Who hath firſt given to him, and it ſhall be recompenſed to him again?* They that have not firſt given to God ſomething which is their own, ſomething which they never received from him, cannot oblige him to recompenſe them. And indeed it is contrary to common ſenſe, that a man ſhould deſerve any thing of another by giving him back what he received from him, and ſo that God ſhould be a debtor to us for thoſe very good works which himſelf hath wrought in us. Thus ſome of the Papiſts themſelves argue. *If God*, ſays one, *gives a ſoul grace, he gives it freely, and no man will ſay that becauſe he hath given him one gift, he ows him another, therefore when God freely gives a ſoul charity, he is not conſequently bound to give it glory.* Nay the other go farther, and argue that the more good a man doth the more he receives from God, (ſeeing it is of God that he doth that very good) and therefore is ſo far from obliging God by what he doth, that he is himſelf more bound to God. And indeed it is a clear caſe, that the more a man ows to God, the leſs capable he is of deſerving any thing of God, but the more good a man doth the more he ows, becauſe the more he doth the more he receives, and conſequently the beſt Saints, that do moſt, ſeeing they likewiſe receive moſt, muſt needs owe moſt; and therefore merit leaſt. Indeed did they do their good works meerly in their own ſtrength, and without receiving grace from God, ſo that they could call their works purely their own, more might be ſaid in defence of Merits; But when no believer in the World ever doth one jot of good more than what he is enabled by God to do, and which God works by him; it follows that ſtill as his works encreaſe, ſo his receipts encreaſe, and as they grow, his merits (to ſpeak ſo for once) abate, he

Si Deus dat animæ charitatem gratis donat, et nullus diceret quod ex eo quod Deus donet aliquod munus alicui, fiat ei alterius muneris debitor, ergo ex eo quod gratis dat animæ charitatem, non debetur conſequenter etiam gloria. Arimin. ubi ſupra. Vid. Bradward. & Durand. ubi ſupra.

he being in every good work a new debtor to God for the grace whereby he did it.

Arg. 5. The good works of believers are imperfect, and therefore they cannot merit by them. How can a man merit any reward of the Lawgiver by doing that which doth not answer the Law, which requires not only good works but perfectly good ones? He doth not deserve his wages that doth not do his whole work, and do it as he should. Or how can a man deserve a reward by those works which deserve punishment? Can he deserve the blessing and the curse at the same time, and by the same works? But imperfect good works, though the imperfection of them be not actually imputed, and what is good in them be accepted, yet as imperfect, and falling short of the demands of the Law, do deserve the Curse; for, Gal. 3. 10. *Cursed is every one that continues not in all that is written in the book of the Law to do it.* And the perfection of good works as well as the works themselves is one of those things which are written in the Law, Luk. 10. 27. *Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart*, &c. Now that the good works of believers are imperfect, not only altogether, but each of them in particular, how clear is it to any that ever really exercise themselves in them? Where is there the Saint in the world, but hath some sins mingled with his good works? Who ever holds on in so constant a course of obedience and holiness, but that the good he doth is interrupted with the mixture of some evil? *There is not a just man upon the earth that doth good, and sins not*, says *Solomon* Eccles. 7. 20. *And if we say we have no sin we deceive our selves, and the truth is not in us*, saith St. *John*, 1 Joh. 1. 8. And *David* who was as holy as any Papist upon earth, speaks for himself, and all the world besides, that if God should *mark iniquity*, none could *stand*, Psal. 130. 3. And though our Adversaries tell us here *Exc.* that the intermixture of some venial sins, with the good works of the Saints, doth not hinder their perfection, nor meritoriousness, and that their sins are no other: that believers may as they walk toward heaven, have a little dust fall upon them, but do not wallow in the mire; that they do but turn aside in Gods ways, not turn their backs upon them, but halt in them, not forsake them, but squint a little on the World, not turn their faces wholly toward it. Yet this will not suffice till they *Answ.* can solidly establish the distinction of mortal sins, and venial upon Scripture foundations, which they never can till they have made an *Index expurgatorius* upon the Bible it self, and sentenced the holy Penmen of it as *Authores damnatos*, *condemned* them for making those sins *mortal* which they themselves would so fain have only *venial*. No nor after they have done that, till they can produce some one Saint who hath lived all his days without ever falling into any one of their mortal sins. Let them ransack their whole Colledge of Cardinals, search all their Religious houses, examine *Peters* Chair it self, and they shall not find one that dares (and Protestants will not) pretend to be wholly without,

out, or free from some or other of those sins, which they themselves count Mortal.

And if we look to the good works of the Saints in particular, we shall find some defectiveness in every one of them, the best proceed but from an imperfect principle; the new nature, which, in believers during their present state, is but in its growth, not come to its full maturity; it shall be made perfect, and therefore is not yet perfect. God promises that believers shall grow in grace, Psal. 92. 12, 13, 14. *The righteous shall flourish as the Palm tree, and grow like a Cedar in Lebanon.* They are commanded to grow, 2 Pet. 3. 18. *Grow in grace.* It is their endeavour to grow, Phil. 3. 12, 13, 14. *They reach out to things before them, and press forward,* &c. And it is their priviledge that they do grow, 2 Cor. 4. 16. *Their inner man is renewed day by day.* And there is no time of a Saints life in which it is not his duty to grow in grace; the command obligeth them all as long as they are on this side heaven. But if grace were come to its full perfection, there would be no more need of growing in it, no more obligation so to do. Besides, there is no Saint, but as he hath some grace in him, so he hath some remainders of corruption too, *sin dwelling in him,* as well as *Paul* had, Rom. 7. 17, the *Law* of the *members* as well as the Law of the *mind,* ver. 23. *flesh* as well as *spirit,* Gal. 5. 17. As one principle which draws him off from sin, so another, which inclines him to it; as one which puts him upon good, so another which makes him in some degree averse to it, as something which makes him do the work, and in some measure as he should; so something which checks and cools him, and makes him not do it altogether as he should. Now from hence ariseth a double imperfection in the best works of the Saints: One is a want or failing of that intenseness, or those degrees of goodness, that height and excellency of it which the Law of God requires; for where the principle it self is not fully perfect, the actings of that principle cannot but be imperfect; the effect can be no better than the cause: The other is the adherence of some evil to the work, some spot or stain cleaving to it: as sin dwells in the same soul, the same mind, the same will and affections with grace, so it mingles it self with the actings of grace; there being something of mud in the fountain, it dirties the stream; the vessel having a tang, derives it to the liquor that runs out of it; there being something of venom in the flower, it insinuates it self into, and mingles with that sweet vapour that comes from it: so that upon the whole every act of a Saint is some way or other defective, and blemished, and comes short of a legal accurateness, and therefore is not able to abide a legal trial: that any are at all accepted with God, it is upon the sole account of Jesus Christ, 1 Pet. 2. 5. Him we find, *Rev.* 8. 3. offering incense with the prayers of the Saints, and his Type the High Priest, Exod. 28. 38. *Bearing the iniquities of the holy things which the children of Israel hallowed in all their holy gifts.* And sure then if the good works of believers

lievers are accepted for Christs sake, they are not rewarded for their own; their goodness cannot deserve a recompence, when their infirmities need a covering: their weakness argues their not answering the Law, and if they do not answer it, they cannot deserve to be rewarded according to it.

Arg. 6. Believers need forgiveness of sin, and therefore cannot by all their good deeds merit life. That they need forgiveness is plain not only by the former Argument, (in that there is no man so full of good works, but he hath some sins mingled with them; and there are no good works in this life, so full of goodness, but they have some mixture of evil too.) and by our Saviours command to pray for pardon, and that daily, Mat. 6. 12. *Forgive us our debts.* But likewise by the practice of the Saints in Scripture, *Psal.* 25. 11. *Dan.* 9. 19. 1 King. 8. 34, 36. and the practice of the Papists themselves; How many *Pater Nosters*, and *Kyrie Eleesons*, do they daily say? The veriest Saints among them confess their sins, and pray for pardon. The Pope himself, for all his *Holiness*, and his *pardoning* other mens sins, yet *confesseth his own.* Now if Saints themselves need forgiveness, how do they deserve Heaven? How can the Conscience of sin, and the merit of life consist together? He that prays for pardon confesseth himself a sinner, and he that owns himself a sinner, acknowledgeth himself to be worthy of death; and if he be worthy of death, how is he worthy of life? If he deserve a punishment, sure he doth not at the same time deserve a reward? If they shall say, that they pray only for the pardon of venial sins, it signifies little; they had as good keep their breath for something else, seeing after all their seeking the forgiveness of them, yet they must be fain to expiate them hereafter in Purgatory: And if they do by their venial sins deserve Purgatory, how do they at the same time merit Heaven? And therefore either let the Papists cease to pray for pardon, or to pretend to merit. To beg forgiveness, if they do not indeed sin, is to mock God, and to pretend to merit if they do, is to mock themselves.

Arg. 7. The good works of believers are not commensurate and equal in goodness, and value to eternal life, and therefore cannot deserve it. Common sense will evince the truth of the consequence. Who can say that such a work deserves such a reward, if it be not equal in worth, and value to it, any more than that such a Commodity deserves such a price, if it be not of equal worth with it? And Papists themselves grant as much; *Aquinas* makes the just reward of a mans labour, and the price of a thing bought to be both alike of Justice, and requires an equality wherever strict justice is. And that the good works of the Saints are not equal to eternal life, unless they be grown better than they were in *Pauls* time, is clear by Rom. 8. 18. *For I reckon, that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in us*: And if the sufferings of the Saints are not worthy of their glory,

Vid. 1. 2. q. 114. Art. 1.

glory, ſure none of their other works are; their ſufferings, (wherein they are not meerly paſſive, but active too, for *they chuſe to ſuffer afflictions*, Heb. 11. 25.) being ſome of the moſt excellent of their works, and in which moſt grace is exerciſed. The Papiſts common Anſwer is, That the good works of Believers as they come meerly from them, and their free will are not worthy of, or equal to their glory, but yet that they are ſo as they proceed from grace, a ſupernatural principle in their hearts. But we have ſeen before, that that very principle though excellent, noble, divine as to the nature of it; yet in reſpect of its degrees, is but imperfect, and therefore the actings which proceed from it muſt needs be ſo too, there being ſuch a mixture of ſin in the heart where grace is ſeated, it mingles it ſelf with the actings of grace in our works. And how then can we ſay that an imperfect work deſerves a full reward? That the poor lame performances of believers are equal to that abundant glory, which God in his goodneſs hath prepared for them?

Exc.

Anſw.

Arg. 8. Believers cannot recompenſe to God what they have already received of him, and therefore cannot by all they do merit any thing of him. They that are debtors to God can by no means make him a debtor to them; when they owe him ſo much, he can owe them nothing. Debt to God muſt be diſcharged before any obligation can be laid upon him. And that Saints cannot recompenſe God for what they have received of him, is clear by what was ſaid before, for they have received of him all they are, all they have, all they do, their being, their powers and faculties, their good inclinations, principles, actings. And what can a man return to God which may recompenſe him for all theſe? It is a known ſaying of the Philoſopher, That no man can requite God, or his Parents. And indeed if a Son cannot return equal to his Father for the being he hath received from him, though but ſubordinately to God, much leſs can he recompenſe God himſelf for that, and all elſe which he hath received from him. But deſerving a reward at Gods hands, eſpecially ſuch a one as we ſpeak of, is much more than meerly to requite him for what he hath done for us, and therefore ſuch a reward, by all our good works we can never poſſibly merit. I conclude this with that of *Bradwardine*, *God hath given to and for man, miſerable captive man, man obnoxious to eternal flames, himſelf made man, ſuffering, dying, buried, that he might redeem him, and he promiſeth, and giveth himſelf wholly to be enjoyed by man as his great reward, which infinitely exceeds any meer man:* And conſequently all his power, all his holineſs, all his good works. What Saint on earth can requite God for giving himſelf for him, and how then can he merit the enjoyment of God? If the firſt be above his requital, I am ſure the other is above his deſert.

Ariſt. Eth. l. 8.

Deus dedit homini, & pro miſero homine, & captivo, Flammis perpetuis obligato, ſeipſum incarnatum, paſſum, & ſepultum, in precium temporaliter redimendo; promittit inſuper & dat ſeipſum totum in præmium fœliciter conſumendo, quod excedit quemlibet parum hominem infinite. Bradw. p. 345.

Certe domine qui me feciſti, debeo amori tuo meipſum totum, qui me redemiſti, debeo meipſum totum: imo tantum debeo amori tuo plus quam meipſum, quantum tu es major me, pro quo dediſti teipſum, & cui promittis teipſum. Anſelm. apud Bradw. ibid.

Arg. 9.

Arg. 9. He that deserves any thing of another must do something whereby that other hath some benefit or advantage, for no man can be said to merit at anothers hand, by doing that which is advantageous only to himself. But Believers, by all they do, profit themselves, if any, not God; they bring no gain, make no addition to him, it is their own good, their own happiness they farther and advance by all their holiness and good works, but not God's, who is still, after all the good Works of all the Saints on earth for these 5000 years and upwards, the same he was before: All their mites have added nothing to his Treasures, all their drops nothing to his Ocean. *Job* 22. 2. *Can a man be profitable to God as a man that is wise may be profitable to himself?* ver. 3. *Is it gain to him that thou makest thy ways perfect?* And therefore it must needs follow, that Believers by their good works deserve nothing of God.

Arg. 10. The Popish Doctrine of Merits highly derogates from the honour of God and Christ, and therefore is not to be admitted.

1. It derogates from the glory of God;

1. In his Liberality, for God is the most liberal giver, *Jam.* 1. 5. Every good, we say, by how much the greater it is, so much the more communicative it is, and God being the greatest good, must needs be most communicative, most liberal, and that too to such an height, as nothing can be conceived more so. Now he that gives freely, is more liberal, more generous, more communicative, than he that gives out of debt, or on the account of desert, and therefore that most free and liberal way of giving must be ascribed unto God, as most sutable to him, and we cannot say that God gives any thing to his Creatures out of debt, but we diminish the glory of his liberality.

2. In his Liberty. It is a subjecting him to his Creature. He that ows any thing to another is so far forth subject to him; *the borrower is servant to the lender.* He that gives all freely, is more free himself, than he that gives only because he ows it. And therefore if God be a debtor to man, and bound in Justice to reward him, he doth not act so freely as if no such obligation lay upon him. *Prov.* 22. 7.

2. It derogates likewise from the glory of Christ, because from his Merits. Whoever merits any thing, acquires thereby a right to that thing which before he had not, either in whole or in part. A day-labourer hath no right to his wages, but by his work, and till his work be done cannot challenge it; and so if Believers merit eternal life, they do by their works get a title to it, which before their working they had not: and if they do by their works acquire a right wholly to eternal life, then Christ hath not at all merited it for them; if in part they merit it, then Christ hath but in part merited it for them; and something there is in eternal life which Christ hath not merited. And it is in vain to say that Christ hath merited for the Saints a power of meriting, and that it is more for his glory to enable them to do it, than to do it wholly himself. For, besides that, the Papists can never prove that Christ hath *vid. Cham. tom. tert. l.* 14. *c.* 20. *Exc.* *Answ.*

merited any such power for Believers, it is really more for the honour of his bounty to purchase all for them himself, than to enable them to it. As he is more bountiful who gives a man a great estate out of his own proper goods, than he that enables him to get an estate by his labour and industry.

Indeed *Bellarmine* speaks plainly, that God would have his children merit Heaven, because it is more for their honour than to have it given them. *De Justif. l.* 5. *c.* 3. So little is his eminency concern'd for God's glory, as zealous as he is for the credit of the Saints: methinks he might have remembred, that what is given to the one is taken away from the other; and if it be more for the Saints honour to have their inheritance by way of merit, yet it is more for God's glory that they have it as a gift.

Other arguments might be added, but I had rather mention enough than all. I have been larger in these, because, though some of the more learned among the Papists place the meritoriousness of good works upon something else than the intrinsick excellency of them, yet this is the most popular and dangerous error among them, the vulgar sort not understanding the distinctions and niceties of some few Scholars, are more apt to believe their good works to be of their own nature, and for their own excellency meritorious. More briefly therefore of the rest: *Bellarmine* bears us in hand, that the compleat meritoriousness of good works ariseth from the addition of God's promise to them; so that they which would not have merited eternal life otherwise, (though proportioned to it, if he may be believed) yet the promise being made, are truly worthy of it.

Against this we argue; that if the accession of the promise make good works to be truly meritorious, then it must be either because the promise makes good works better, more excellent and noble than they would have been, had no such promise been made; or else because (which is this Cardinals notion) the promise obligeth God in justice to reward them, which without it he were not bound to do.

1. But the addition of God's promise doth not raise the rate of good works, not ennoble them, nor add any intrinsecal dignity or worth to them, nor make them in themselves better than they would have been if such a promise had not been made, the promise being something extrinsecal to the works themselves, *&c.* From whence therefore they can receive no new degrees of inward goodness or worth. The proper formal excellency of a good action ariseth from its conformity to its rule, the rightness of the principle from whence it proceeds, and to which it is directed: if therefore it proceed from a supernatural principle, and be referred to a supernatural end, and be in other things agreeable to its proper rule, which is the command of God, and not the promise; (for that though it be an encouragement to work, yet is not the rule of our working) it hath all in it that is necessary to the essence of a good work, whether

whether any promiſe be made to it or not. Indeed, the more high and intenſe the principle of Grace is from whence it proceeds, and the more directly and expreſly it is ordered to its end, and the more exactly it is conformable to its rule, the more good, the more gracious it is; but the adding of the promiſe makes it not one jot more gracious, more intrinſecally worthy: had God never made any promiſe of rewarding the good works of Believers, yet they would have been as good as now they are. Nay, I meet with a School-man that ſays, if the promiſe make any alteration in the nature of a good work, it is rather by diminiſhing from its goodneſs than adding to it; ſo far as it may be an occaſion of a mans acting leſs out of love to God, and more out of love to himſelf. However did any new goodneſs accrew to a good work by the acceſſion of God's promiſe, it would follow, that the leaſt good work of a Saint ſhould thereby be ſo elevated and raiſed in its worth and value, as to be made equal to the greateſt; the giving a cup of cold water to one of Chriſt's Diſciples, ſhould be equal to a mans laying down his life for Chriſt; for they which agree in ſome third, agree between themſelves; (as the learned Biſhop *Davenant* argues) and ſo if the giving a cup of cold water to a Diſciple of Chriſt, be by God's promiſe made equal to eternal life, dying for Chriſt being no more, even after the acceſſion of the promiſe, they muſt be both equally good, and (in the Papiſts ſtile) equally meritorious actions, becauſe both commenſurate to, and meritorious of the ſame reward. Nay, ſuppoſing God ſhould promiſe eternal life to a meerly moral work, which had no ſupernatural goodneſs in it, or to an action in it ſelf indifferent, yet that action, though not gracious in it ſelf, ſhould be of as great dignity and value as any the beſt and moſt ſpiritual action what-ever; for the beſt action cannot be imagined by Papiſts themſelves to deſerve any more than eternal life, and even a meer moral or indifferent one would by the help of the promiſe deſerve as much, and yet the Papiſts acknowledg that none but gracious ones can deſerve it. And how abſurd would it ſeem in the things of this life, for a promiſe or contract thus to raiſe the value of a mans labour or mony, above the due eſtimation, and intrinſick worth of it? Would it not ſeem ſtrange, nay ridiculous to affirm, when two men buy two parcels of a commodity, of equal worth in themſelves, but at unequal rates; ſuppoſe the one at 100 *l.* as the full value, the other at 5 *l.* that the contract made between the buyer and ſeller, or the promiſe of the ſeller to let his Chapman have his goods at ſuch a price, did raiſe the value of his five pounds, and make it equal to the others hundred? who would grant this? who would not ſay that ſuch a commodity were in a manner given away, or the juſt price of it abated, rather than the value of the mony raiſed? It is a caſe here, and what our Adverſaries ſpeak of good works being made meritorious by the addition of God's promiſe, is no leſs ridiculous and void of reaſon.

Nec illa promiſſio facit opus melius, ut patet per ſubſtantiam operis, & per omnes ejus circumſtantias inductive; imo forſitan minus bonum; facit enim intentionem minus ſinceram; quienim prius operabatur pure propter Deum ſolum, nunc forſitan operetur propter retributionem promiſſam. Bradw. de Cauſa Dei, l. 1. p. 339.

Quæ conveniunt in aliquo tertio conveniunt inter ſe. De juſt. actu. c. 63.

2. The addition of God's promiſe of rewarding good works, doth not bind him in ſtrict juſtice to reward them. We acknowledg that he is engaged, by his immutability and faithfulneſs, to reward the holineſs of his Saints, having once promiſed ſo to do; but that is no more than to ſay, that God is engaged to act like himſelf, ſuitably to his own nature; it is agreeable to God, as God, to be faithful and true to his word; if he were not faithful, he could not be God, not to be *faithful* were to *deny himſelf*, 2 *Tim.* 2. 13. But it is quite another thing to be bound in ſtrict juſtice to render to men ſuch a reward as he hath promiſed. For the object of juſtice being the equality of the thing given, and the thing received, and it being the buſineſs of juſtice to ſee to that equality, and that ſo much be returned for ſo much, God being bound by his promiſe to make ſuch an equality of the reward to the work, argues imperfection in him; for it implies that God is mans debtor, and hath received more of him than hitherto he hath given him, or that a mans works exceed all his receits, and all God's former bounty: in a word, that man hath done more for God, than God hath yet done for him, on the account whereof he is bound to give him more, (*viz.* the reward) that ſo there may be an equality. And if this do not imply imperfection in God, what doth? Beſides, if after God hath promiſed glory to a righteous man walking in his righteouſneſs, yet he ſhould not give it him, ſuch an one could only ſay that God did break his word, or act contrary to his faithfulneſs, but he could not ſay he acted unjuſtly, or did not give him as much as he received from him. *If* (ſaith a Papiſt himſelf) *God ſhould not give glory to a man that died in a ſtate of Grace, or ſhould take it away from one already poſſeſſed of it, yet in ſo doing he ſhould not be unrighteous.* To conclude, juſtice properly taken implies an equality, and where equality is not, there cannot be juſtice; but there is no equality not only between God and man, but between mans working, and Gods rewarding; and it is not the addition of a promiſe that either levels the reward to the work, or raiſeth the work to the reward.

Si Deus decedenti in gratia non daret gloriam, aut ſi habenti gloriam auferret, tamen nihil injuſtum faceret. Durand. ubi ſupr. Aquin. 1. 2. p. 114. Art. 1.

But, ſay ſome of our Adverſaries, good works become meritorious of eternal life, by being ſprinkled with Chriſt's blood, commended to God by his merits. We would willingly ſee the proof of it; let them tell us, if they can, what it is which Chriſt's merits do ſuper-add to the goodneſs of the work whereby it becomes meritorious, when before, though truly good, it was not ſo. We grant indeed, that as there is no goodneſs in our ſelves, ſo likewiſe none in our works, which is not the effect of Chriſt's merits; but ſuppoſing the goodneſs of them, we would know what it is that Chriſt's merits do further add to them to make them meritorious. True indeed, the merits of Chriſt do procure both acceptance and reward for the good works of the Saints, but they do not make theſe works intrinſecally perfect: they are the cauſe why the failings of the Saints in them are not imputed, but they do not remove

move those failings and weaknesses from them. Nay more, Christ's merits do no more make the good works of believers meritorious, than Christ communicates to believers themselves a power of meriting, but that can never be; a meer creature is uncapable of such a power: to merit is proper to Christ only, and cannot agree to any of his members; the power of meriting eternal life consists in the infinite virtue of the person meriting answering to the glory merited; and therefore to say that Christ, by his merits, makes the good works of the Saints meritorious, is to say that he communicates to themselves an infinite power, and to their works an infinite excellency. *Vid. Rivett. Orthod. Cathol.*

To all these I add but this one general Argument. It is not lawful for men to trust in their own works, and therefore they do not merit any thing of God by them; for what reason can be given why a man might not put confidence in them, if they really deserved a reward of God, and so were really the cause of mans salvation? It is true indeed, the confidence of a believer, and his rejoycing in the goodness and safety of his spiritual estate, and hope of life, may be helped on by, and in a sense proceed from his obedience and good works, because they are an evidence of his faith, and so of his interest in Christ, acceptance with God, and title to the heavenly inheritance; but this is quite another thing; there is a vast difference between a mans taking comfort in his obedience, as the evidence of his title to glory; and trusting in it, as that which gives him that title. *Nehemiah*, though he reflect on his good deeds, and comfort himself in them, yet expects his reward on another account, *Chap.* 13. *ver.* 22. *Spare me according to the greatness of thy mercy*; and so our Psalmist in the Text, *To thee belongeth mercy, for thou rendereſt to every man according to his works*: and how frequently do we find the Saints disclaiming all confidence in their own holiness and obedience, when they have to do with God and his judgment? But to descend from the Saints to a Cardinal, *Bellarmine* himself after his laborious disputes in defence of merits, and for justification by works, in the very same Chapter where he pleads for the lawfulness of mens trusting in them, at last hath this conclusion, *That, because of the uncertainty of mans own righteousness, and the danger of vain-glory, it is the safest way for men to place their whole confidence in the mercy and goodness of God alone.* And if *Bellarmine* say it is safest, I will say it is wisest, and the Cardinal doth but trifle in contending so much for the merit of good works, and so in a business of the highest importance, putting men upon a course which he himself dares not say is safe.

Propter incertitudinem propriæ justitiæ, & periculum inanis gloriæ, tutissimum est totam fiduciam in sola Dei misericordia, & benignitate reponere. De Justif. l. 5. c. 7. prop. 3.

Having said thus much for the confirmation of the truth against the Papists, it is high time we give them leave to speak for themselves, and hear what they can say for the merit of good works in relation to the reward of eternal glory.

First therefore they tell us, that eternal life is in Scripture frequently called a *reward*, *Matt.* 5. 12. *Great is your reward in Heaven*; 2 Joh. 8. *Obj.* 1.

But.

But that we receive a full reward; Rev. 22. 12. *I come quickly, and my reward is with me*: and so in other places. Now, say they, *Mercas & meritum*, a reward and merit are correlates; so that merit infers reward, and reward implies merit; and therefore if Heaven, which is given to believers, be the reward of their works, their works must needs be the merit of that reward.

Answ. 1. A reward may be taken either strictly, and properly, for that which is given to a man not only on consideration of his work, but is proportioned, and measured out according to it, and is in strict justice due to him for it. And in this sense we deny that eternal life is ever in the Scripture called a reward; and let our Adversaries prove it if they can. Or, secondly, it is taken improperly and metaphorically, and then there is no such relation between it and merit, as the objection mentions. שכר Thus, *Gen.* 30. 18. *God hath given me my hire, or reward*, saith *Leah*, and yet who can say that she merited a son at God's hands, by giving her hand-maid to her husband? *Psal.* 127. 3. *The fruit of the womb is his reward*; and I wonder then what is the merit? Indeed, what is reward in the latter part of the verse, but the same that heritage in the former? So, *Gen.* 15. 1. *I am thy shield, and thy exceeding great reward.* And will the Papists say that God himself falls under mens merit? and yet so it must be, if there be such a necessary relation between reward and merit. Yet more fully, *Rom.* 4. 4. *To him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt.* Here are plainly two sorts of rewards, one proper, and of debt; the other improper, and of grace. And therefore I conclude, that eternal life is called a reward in Scripture improperly, and metaphorically, and no otherwise than as any thing given to another on consideration of service done, may be called a reward, though it be a thousand times greater than the service is, or though it be not at all due to him to whom it is given; as when a Master gives something to his slave who hath done his work well, though he were not bound to it, his servant being his mony, and being bound to do do his work, and do it well, though no reward should be given him.

2. As eternal life is sometimes called a reward, so it is other times called a gift, *Rom. 6.* 23. If it be here excepted, that it is properly called a reward, and metaphorically a gift: *Camero* answers, that that which is properly a gift, may metaphorically be called a reward, as if it be given on the account of some service, as when a Master gives a gift to his servant for doing his work, which yet (as before) he was not obliged to give; but that which is properly a reward, can by no means be called a gift, because a real proper reward implies something worthy of it, whereby it is deserved, and the reward is a debt due in justice to such a work; and so if eternal life be a reward, it cannot at all be called a gift, at least without an unpardonable *catachresis*; whereas, though it be properly a gift, it may figuratively be called a reward, because of some resemblance to it, in that God rewards men with eternal glory after they have

Exc. *Answ.* *Oper. p.* 44. *c.* 1.

have done him service, though they were bound to have served him, however no such reward were to be given them. And yet again, eternal life is called an inheritance, as well as a reward; and, says a learned man, either both these names are given it properly, or both figuratively; or one properly, and the other figuratively; the first cannot be, for to be properly an inheritance and reward too, will imply a contradiction: who knows not that a reward properly taken is always deserved, but an inheritance is not; and so eternal life, if it be properly both, must be given to some antecedent desert, because a reward; and without it, because an inheritance; and so freely, and not freely; out of justice, and not out of justice. If it be metaphorically only called both a reward and an inheritance, we gain as much as we need, for then it is not properly a reward, and so not truly deserved, the Papists themselves being judges. If one be taken properly, the other figuratively, it may easily be proved that the figurative sense must rather be applyed to its being a reward than an inheritance, unless we will say not only that eternal life is properly a reward, but believers are properly mercenaries; and if the Papists are so fond of their merits, that rather than fail they will own themselves mercenaries, much good may it do them, we envy them not the honour.

Chamier. de bon. oper. c. 6.

Obj. 2. Several places they alledge where the Scripture speaks of believers as worthy of the reward: 2 *Thes.* 1. 5. *That ye may be counted worthy of the Kingdom of God:* Rev. 3. 4. *They shall walk with me in white, for they are worthy.* Much stress they lay upon the word *worthy*, and so argue the Saints to merit eternal life, because they are said to be worthy of it.

εἰς τὸ καταξιωθῆναι ὑμᾶς τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ. ἵνα περιπατήσωσι μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐν λευκοῖς ὅτι ἄξιοί εἰσι.

The *worthiness* spoken of in such places, is plainly the Saints fitness for, and suitableness to, the reward of glory; that disposition which God works in those whom he intends to glorifie: of which the Apostle speaks, *Col.* 1. 12. *Who hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the Saints in light:* where the vulgar Latin renders it, *Qui dignos, nos fecit,* though the Greek ἱκανώσαντι signifie no more than, as we translate it, making *meet*, or *fit*. And in how many other places is the same word used for fitness, or suitableness? *Matth.* 3. 8. *Bring forth fruits meet for repentance*, that is, such as become those who truly repent, and yet the Greek hath it, worthy of repentance: and if we take it in the Popish sense, what fruits are they which are worthy of repentance, so as to merit it? not works before it, for they themselves will not affirm works wrought before the first grace, to merit that grace, at least by way of condignity. Nor can it be said of works after repentance; for who is so weak as to say, a man may truly and properly deserve what he hath already, by something which he doth afterwards? Other places confirm our interpretation of the word, *Eph.* 4. 1. *That ye walk worthy of the vocation where-with ye are called*; Ἀξίως περιπατῆσαι is no more than to walk suitably or agreeably to their calling. And *Phil.* 1. 27.

καρποὺς ἀξίους τῆς μετανοίας.

Ἀξίως

Ἀξίως τῆς εὐαγγελίς πολιτεύεσθαι, to have our converſation *worthy* of the Goſpel, is no more, than as our tranſlation renders it, as *becomes the Goſpel.* And ἀξιωθῆναι, 2 *Theſſ.* 1. 5. which we render to *count worthy*, is no more than *dignari*, to vouchſafe: and the ſame uſe both of the Greek and Latin word is frequent in Heathen Authors, ſo that nothing for merit in a proper ſenſe can be inferred from it. Or, if dignity muſt needs be in the caſe, the Greek word will rather ſignify, to dignify, or put honour upon another, than ſuppoſe any dignity inherent in him, or, if you pleaſe ſo to deal with a man, as if he were worthy, whether he be ſo or not; and thus it will rather imply a kind of imputation of worthineſs to a perſon, than its being really in him.

Conjugio Ænea Ventris dignitate ſuperbo. Virg. *Quos quoniam cœli nondum dignamur honore.* Ovid. Ἀξιώμενος, *qui imprimis honore dignus habetur, vel plurimi fit.* Ἀξιοῦσθαι *dignum judicare.* Suid.

Again, when the Saints are ſaid to be worthy, it is not to be underſtood of any ſuch dignity in them, as anſwers to what the Law requires, or of an abſolute worthineſs of the reward, but rather of a comparative one; when they are ſaid to be worthy, they are compared with wicked men, in reſpect of whom they may be ſaid ſo to be; becauſe, although, in ſtrict juſtice, they do not merit life, yet they are qualified for it, and ſuited to it, by having thoſe holy diſpoſitions wrought in them, which God intended to furniſh them with, in order to the enjoyment of ſo glorious a recompence as he hath deſigned them for.

Obj. 3. Bellarm. *de Juſtific. l.* 5. *c.* 3.

Thoſe places of Scripture are objected, in which the reward is ſaid to be given men according to the proportion and meaſure of their works and labour: from whence they infer, that in rewarding good works, God hath reſpect not meerly to his liberality, or promiſe, or favour, but to the dignity and efficacy of the works themſelves; ſo that as evil works do really deſerve eternal death, good ones do likewiſe deſerve eternal life.

Anſw. The general anſwer to this Argument was laid down in the explication of the Text, *viz.* That God's rewarding men according to their works, is to be underſtood of the nature and kind of them, not of the value and dignity of them, that they who do well, ſhall fare well; and they that do otherwiſe, ſhall be otherwiſe dealt with: it ſhall be well with the righteous, and ill with the wicked; there is a bleſſing for the one, and a curſe for the other. As for the particular Scriptures, they may be eaſily anſwered: firſt, my text is brought in againſt me, that God *renders to every man according to his work*, but it carries its anſwer along with it, that though God reward men according to their works, and ſo give life to thoſe that are righteous, yet it is out of meer mercy he doth it: let but *Bellarmine* read the whole verſe together, and make the beſt of it he can. And for *Luke* 6. 38. *With the ſame meaſure you mete, it ſhall be meaſured to you again*; either it is to be underſtood not of God's judging and rewarding men in the future life, but of mans judgment in this life; as if he had ſaid, as you deal with others, ſo others ſhall deal with you; you ſhall have ſuch as you bring, and be paid in your own coyn: Or elſe, if it be meant of God's judgment, yet it is of a judgment of

of condemnation, not of absolution, and so is wholly impertinent to the business in hand; Christ doth not say, do not absolve others, lest God should absolve you; but, do not condemn others, *i. e.* rashly, sinfully, lest God condemn you righteously; and so much seems to be implyed in the parallel place, *Matth.* 7. 1, 2. 1 *Cor.* 3. 8. is alledged too, *Every man shall receive his own reward according to his own labour*, but to little purpose; for the Apostle speaks not there of the salvation of some, and the damnation of others, but only of the difficulty of the salvation of some, who had built on the foundation, *wood, hay, stubble, ver.* 12, 13, 14, 15. who, he says, should be saved, yet so as by fire: some should be saved with more difficulty than others, yet all should be saved. The othe other places they bring here (*Matth.* 16. 27. *Reward every man according to his works*, Gal. 6. 7. *What-ever a man soweth, that also shall he reap*, Rom. 2. 6. *Who will render to every man according to his deeds*,) need no more than the general answer before given, which is confirmed by *ver.* 7, 8, 9, 10. of the same Chapter, which speak plainly of the kind or quality, according to which the reward shall be given, not of the worth or dignity of them; and yet it is further assured by the last place the Papists alledge under this head, *Rev.* 22. 12. *To give to every man as his work shall be.* This text is a Commentary on all the rest, for what is in the other places, κατὰ τὰ ἔργα, according to their works, is in this place, ὡς τὸ ἔργον ἔστιν αὐτοῦ ἔσται, *as his work shall be*; that is, if a good work, eternal life; if an evil one, eternal death.

Those places are urged, in which eternal life is so said to be given to good works, as that those works are the reason why it is given them. The chief are, *Matth.* 25. 34, 35. *Inherit the Kingdom prepared for you*, &c. *for I was an hungred*, &c. *Rev.* 7. 14, 15. *These are they which come out of great tribulation*, &c. *therefore are they before the Throne of God.* *Obj.* 4.

The stress of this Argument lies on those particles, *for*, *therefore*, &c. too slender twigs to keep the Popish cause from sinking. For they do not alwaies signify a connexion by way of causality, or one thing being the true and proper cause of another, but only by way of consequence, or the following of one thing upon another; the connexion of two things, whereof the one is Antecedent, the other Consequent: as if you say it is day, *for* the Sun is up; you then assert the Suns being up to be the reason of its being day, and rightly too; but if you say, it is day, *for* I see the Sun; you will not affirm your seeing the Sun to be the reason of its being day, and your *for* will signifie no more than that your seeing the Sun, follows upon its being day; you prove well that it is day, because you see the Sun; but you prove it not by the cause, but by the effect. If you should say Popery is a wicked Religion, *for* it makes Treason lawful, you shew why it is a wicked Religion; but if you say some Papists have been wicked wretches, *for* they have been convicted of Treason, and hang'd for their pains; you do not al- *Answ.*

ledge their being convicted, and hang'd, as the cauſe of their wickedneſs. So likewiſe in the places urged upon us, when the reward is ſaid to be given to men *for* or *becauſe* they have done thus and thus, that doth not imply their having done ſo and ſo to be the proper cauſe of the reward given them, but only the connexion between their work and their reward, their ſo doing, and ſo receiving; 1 *Tim.* 1. 13. *Paul* ſpeaking of his blaſpheming, and perſecuting, ſays he obtained mercy, *becauſe* he did it ignorantly in unbelief. And can any man ſay, that *Paul*'s ignorance and unbelief (allow that they might leſſen the ſinfulneſs of his perſecution and blaſphemy,) were the meritorious cauſes of his obtaining mercy? *Matth* 16. 2. *When it is evening ye ſay it will be fair weather, for the ſkie is red.* Is the redneſs of the sky the cauſe of fair weather, or only an indication of it? when therefore Chriſt invites the Saints to inherit the Kingdom prepared for them, *&c.* becauſe he was an hungred, and they gave him meat, *&c.* he doth not thereby ſignifie that their good works were the meritorious cauſes of their inheriting that Kingdom, but only the *Antecedents of it*, and the *Evidences of their title to it.* And that is confirmed by our Saviour's own words, in that he doth not meerly call them to take poſſeſſion of it, but to *inherit* it, or take poſſeſſion of it as heirs, and by right of inheritance, and conſequently not in the right of their merits. And if he had meant thoſe works he mentions to have been the meritorious cauſe of their ſalvation, he could (with *Bellarmine*'s good leave) have more clearly expreſſed it, and plainly told them, that they had merited the Kingdom, and he was bound in juſtice to ſee them ſetled in the poſſeſſion of it, ſo that it can no more be concluded from hence, that the Saints do, by their good works, deſerve Heaven as their reward, than, if God ſhould have ſaid to the Iſraelites at the end of their forty years voyage toward *Canaan*, Go in now, and poſſeſs the promiſed Land, *for* you have been forty years in the wilderneſs, and have been expoſed to many difficulties and hazards, that therefore they had thereby merited that Land.

Whitak. *contra Duræum. Quia fides factis declaratur, quæ omnibus nota ſunt, & manifeſta, conſentaneum eſt ex factis potius quam fide ſententiam pronunciari.* κληρονομία. *Antequam Chriſtus hæc ſanctorum opera commemorat veras & proprias ſalutis cauſas attingit, &c. quando enim hæreditatem eos adire jubet, Dei in Chriſto Adoptioni omnem juſtitiæ & ſalutis cauſam habuit. Quod enim jure hæreditario aliquis poſſidet, id ſuis operibus minime meretur. Tum quod ſubjungit peratum hoc illis fuiſſe regnum a jactis mundi fundamentis æternum Dei electionem omnibus operum meritis opponit.* Qd.

Exc. If it be ſaid that Chriſt ſpeaks the ſame, & as much of the good works of the Saints as he doth of the evil works of the wicked, the ſame word *for* being uſed, *ver.* 42, as well as *ver.* 35.

Anſw. I anſwer, that it will not follow from thence, that good works are as truly and properly the cauſes of ſalvation, as evil ones are of damnation, there being ſo great a difference in the caſe; and we do not conclude mens wicked works to be the cauſe of their damnation meerly becauſe of the Conjunction uſed by our Saviour in this place, but from the nature of the thing it ſelf, and other Scriptures, which ſpeak more fully to it.

of

As for that place, *Rev.* 7. take but the whole words together, and *Bellarmine* hath his answer, *ver.* 14. *These are they that come out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb*, then follows *ver.* 15. *Therefore are they before the Throne of God.* Wherefore? because not only they come out of great tribulation, but because they have washed their garments, *&c.*

Obj. 5. These places of Scripture are urged where eternal life is promised to good works, *Matth.* 19. 17. *If thou wilt enter into life, keep the Commandments*, ver. 29. *Every one that hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sisters*, &c. *for my name sake, shall receive an hundred fold, and shall inherit everlasting life*; so 1 *Tim.* 4. 8. *Godliness hath the promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come*, Jam. 1. 12. *Shall receive a Crown of life*, &c. Thus they may argue from such places as these: they that do these works to which eternal life is promised, merit that life, but believers do those works, therefore they merit, *&c.*

Answ. 1. It is most false, that they that do that to which the reward of life is promised, do deserve that reward; for (1.) No man deserves that which is promised to him, unless by doing something which is adequate and proportionate to the thing promised, but, as before was declared) the good works of the Saints are not proportionate to eternal life, nor answerable in goodness and dignity to it, and so cannot deserve it. You may promise a man 100 *l.* for a days labour, which is not worth above two shillings, and can it then be said that he deserves your 100 *l*? (2.) A promise may be made to a man for doing that which he is bound to do, though nothing were given him, as when you promise a reward to a slave, who yet was before bound to do your work, and then his doing it doth not deserve what you give him. (3.) Justification is promised to them that believe, and repent; and will the Papists say that a man deserves to be justified by his Faith and Repentance? a King promiseth pardon and life to a Rebel, if he lay down his Arms; to a Robber, if he leave off his robbing; and can it be said that such do deserve pardon or life for laying down their Arms, or leaving off their wicked courses, when they were bound however to have done it, and the Prince was not bound to hire them to it?

2. To the min. propos. we answer, Eternal life is promised to good works, (so to speak for once, though improperly, the reward being promised not to good works themselves, but to them that do them) either, (1.) In the first Covenant, or Covenant of works, and then works are the sole and adequate condition of salvation, and a mans right to it; but then those works must be every way perfect, and answerable to the Law that requires them; and thus the min. prop. is most false, that any believer on earth doth that to which eternal life is promised; for none do all they should, and what they do, yet they do not as they should. (2.) Or in the second, the Covenant of grace, as where the *Crown of life* is promised to them *that love* God, *Jam.* 1. 12. and other

places of the like import: but then it would be considered, (1.) That life is promised not to works alone, nor to works meerly as works, (for that is the very tenor of the Law) but as joyned with, and proceeding from Faith; and then they are *neither the only, nor the compleat or adequate condition of obtaining* eternal life. (2.) That they, to whom this promise is made, are believers, such as are accepted in Christ unto eternal life, even before those works are wrought, and then their works are not *at all the condition of their being entitled to life*, though the evidence of their title to it, and the means of fitting them for it, they may be, (as hereafter more.) And so we say, that however believers do those things to which eternal life in the Covenant of grace is promised, yet they are not entitled to it by their so doing, and therefore do much less deserve it. This may suffice for the other places alledged. As for that of *Matth.* 19. 17. It is manifestly a legal command suited by our Saviour Christ to the question of the young man, who sought for life by the Law; our Saviour therefore accordingly answers him, and sends him to the Law; *What good thing shall I do?* says the young man; *Keep the Commandments*, says Christ; if thou wilt have life by the Law, fulfill the righteousness of the Law; if thou art only for *doing*, *do all* that God hath set thee to do; and this was the way to bring him to Faith, by convincing him of the impossibility of fulfilling the righteousness of the Law, (which he farther doth by the following command, go *sell all thou hast*, &c. where he detects the young mans secret covetousness whereby he had broken the Law,) and that after all his endeavours after a righteousness of works, if he would at last be saved, he must quit his hopes of life by them, and look to Christ alone for it, seeing elsewhere it was not to be found.

Calv. *in loc.* *Neq; melius inanem justitiam refutare potuit, quam si illam ad legem exigeret.* Whitak.

Obj. 6. They argue eternal life to be deserved by believers, because it is given to them out of justice, and that it is so, they prove by 2 *Thess.* 1. 6, 7. *It is a righteous thing with God to recompence tribulation to them that trouble you, and to you that are troubled, rest with us*, &c. 2 Tim. 4. 8. *A Crown of righteousness*, Heb. 6. 10. *God is not unrighteous to forget your work, and labour of love*: and so, *Jam.* 1. 12. *Rev.* 2. 10. and such like places.

Answ. God gives eternal life to believers, not out of strict justice in a proper sense, but out of that which we call justice, or righteousness of faithfulness, or constancy; and though he may be said to reward both Saints and Sinners righteously, or out of righteousness, yet not in the same way, or out of the same kind of righteousness; it is indeed righteous for God to recompence the labours and sufferings of his people, because he hath promised so to do, and it is righteous that he should act according to his own determination and promise, but it is not so righteous for him to do it, as that his recompencing them is formally an act of remunerative justice. And when the Apostle tells the Hebrews, that God is not unrighteous to forget their work and labour of love, he means no more;

than

than that he is not unfaithful, not unconstant, he will not change, nor break his word. But is not the last day called the day of *the righteous judgment of God, who will render to every man according to his deeds?* Rom. 2. 5, 6. The same day, as it is called the day of God's righteous judgment, so is likewise called the day of *redemption*, Eph. 4. 30. And a day of *mercy*, 2 *Tim.* 1. 18. *The Lord grant that he may find mercy in that day*; and a day of refreshment, *Act.* 3. 19. *When the times of refreshing shall come.* And as Christ is said to come to judge the quick and the dead, 2 *Tim.* 4. 1. So likewise to appear to the *salvation* of believers, *Heb.* 9. 28. That great day therefore is properly a day of Mercy, of Redemption, of Refreshment, of Salvation to Believers, and but figuratively a day of righteous judgment as to them, so far as it hath some resemblance to a righteous judgment, because God then gives eternal life with respect to something going before, *viz.* the obedience and holiness of those whom he rewards, not as if it did really deserve that reward, but because it is the way in which God hath determined to act; he gives glory to those that have lived graciously, happiness to them that have continued in the exercise of holiness. *Exc.* ἡμέρα δικαι οκρισίας Θεῦ. *Answ.*

Lastly, they argue from those places of Scripture where God is said not to be an accepter of mens persons, *Rom.* 2. 11. *For there is no respect of persons with God*; Gal. 2. 6. *God accepteth no mans person*; 1 Pet. 1. 17. *Who, without respect of persons, judgeth according to every mans work.* Hence, says *Bellarmine*, *respecting mens persons is contrary to distributive justice, as when a Judge gives a reward without merit, or a greater reward to lesser merits, or on the contrary. Therefore God, in giving rewards, considers mens merits, and according to the diversity of them assigns them their several mansions in Heaven.* *Obj.* 7.

That God is no respecter of persons we grant, and that accepting mens persons is contrary to distributive justice we grant too; but what is that to us, who deny that God's rewarding the good works of the Saints, is an act of distributive justice? for it is (as was before proved) an act of Grace; and accepting of persons hath no place in rewards of Grace, though those rewards be never so much above the deserts, or altogether without deserts in the persons so rewarded. They that laboured but one hour in the Vineyard, received as much as they that had been all the day at work, which ought not to have been according to distributive justice, but well might according to Grace. What God gives, he gives out of no stock but his own, and may he not *do what he will with his own*? What is it to *Bellarmine*, if God will give glory and blessedness to those that never deserved it of him? seeing he wrongs not others in what he gives to some, and he receives nothing from any to distribute to any: what God gives, he may, if he please, not give at all; or he may give out, and dispence to whom, and as he sees fit. *Answ.* *Matth.* 20.

Several other Arguments *Bellarmine* brings to prove the merit of good works, but they are all of lesser consequence, and not like to prevail with

with any that can answer the seven already mentioned, which indeed are the most plausible of any he brings, and the very *seven locks* wherein the *great strength* of this great *Champion* lies, and these being shaven off, (let them grow again if they can) this *Romish Sampson* is but like another man. As for the testimonies he brings out of the Fathers, you need not fear them, and I shall not trouble you with them, having in the beginning given you an account in what sense they generally take the word merit, which makes nothing at all for the Papists cause.

Only one Argument more there is still behind, which, though all the Papists conceal, I will not: you find it, *Act.* 19. 25. *Ye know that by this craft we have our wealth.* I dare say *Demetrius* speaks the very heart of *Bellarmine*; only he was a mechanick, and a fool, and so *uttered all his mind*, whereas our Cardinal was a crafty Jesuite, and knew how to keep in his. But how to answer this Argument I know not, unless by granting the whole. That the doctrine of merits is a gainful doctrine, cannot be denied, when the art of meriting is so liberal an art: It first repleniſheth the Church-Treasury, which again, by the help of Indulgences, empties it self into the Pope's Exchequer. Only these good works suffer some alteration in the exchange, and by I know not what kind of new ferment in their last receptacle, what was merit in the Church Store-house, is in the Pope's purse transubstantiated into metal, which puts his Holiness out of a capacity of saying as *Peter* did, *Gold and silver have I none.* *Act. 3. 6.* The sum is this; the Doctrine of merits is no doubt a fundamental Doctrine, Supererrogations are built upon it, Indulgences are built upon it, Purgatory it self, and Prayers for the dead are built upon it, and, not to go so far as the other World, how many good things in this life are built upon the foundation of Popish good works, many religious Houses, and many religious Orders, many a fair Monastery, and many a stately Temple, and many a fat Benefice. And who can say but the foundation must needs be precious, when the superstructure is so rich? Well then may the Popish Priests stickle for the principal, when the interest is all their own. Well may they contend for merits, as *pro Aris & focis*, as not only for their Altars, but for their Chimneys too, when it is the *zeal* of meriting that keeps their Kitchins *warm.* In a word, well may they *sacrifice to these nets, and burn incense to these drags, when by them their portion is made fat, and their meat plenteous.* *Hab.* 1. 16.

But here two Quæries may be made.

Qu. 1. Upon what account are believers bound to the practice of good works, if they merit not by them?

Answ. Upon several, and good ones too: reason enough we have to perswade us to the practice of good works, though we place no merit in them.

1. God's command is of it self sufficient, though no other reason could be given. He hath commanded us to *be holy*, 1 Pet. 1. 15. *To exercise*

our selves *to godliness*; 1 Tim. 4. 7. To *follow peace and holiness*; Hebr. 12. 14. To *put on bowels of mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind*, &c. Col. 3. 13. To be *ready to distribute, willing to communicate*; 1 Tim. 6. 18. And in a word, that *they who have believed in God, should be careful to maintain good works*; Tit. 3. 8. God is our Sovereign, his will is our rule, and our reason; what he will have us do, we must do, and his command is sufficient to make our actions not only lawful, but necessary, not only to warrant us in the doing of them, but oblige us to do them. And we need not doubt but our actions will be as acceptable to God, which are done out of compliance with his will, as any that are done with a design of meriting at his hands: Obedience will go as far as mercenariness.

2. Good works are the way in which God hath appointed us to walk in order to our obtaining eternal life. They are *via ad regnum*, the path of life, the way to God's Kingdom, the work we are to do ere we receive our reward, the race we are to run ere we be crowned. Though God save us not for them as meritorious causes of his saving us, yet those that are capable of doing them, he doth not ordinarily save without them. *Eph.* 2. 10. *We are his workmanship created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained, that we should walk in them*, Heb. 12. 14. *Without holiness no man shall see the Lord.* Though eternal glory be not (as hath been proved) properly a reward, nor God's giving it an act of strict justice, yet God hath (we acknowledge) determined to give it, *per modum præmii*, after the manner of a reward, in that he will not give men the glory he intends them till they have done him some service, not treat them as Conquerors, who never fought his battel; not respect them as faithful servants, who have been sluggards or loiterers. The *sanctification of the Spirit* as well as *belief of the truth*, must go before *Salvation*, because God hath *from the beginning chosen us to Salvation* by the one as well as the other, 2 *Thess.* 2. 13.

Est ad metam nunquam perveniturr, nisi viam rectam ingrediamur, via tamen non est causa metæ. Whitak.

Twiss.

3. The practice of good works is a special means to strengthen and encrease good habits in us; the actual exercise of Grace heightens the principle of Grace, doing good is the ordinary way whereby we grow better; while we employ our talents we add to our stock; we get Grace while we act it, and lay up for our selves by laying out for God. Active Christians are generally the most thriving Christians, they gather by scattering, and are enriched by their very expences. The more humility men act, the more humble they grow; and the more love they exercise, the more love they have. As the more we use our limbs, the more agile and nimble they are; and the farther a river runs, the broader it spreads.

4. Good works fit us for the reward: it is by them we are *made meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the Saints in light*, Col. 1. 12. Though by Faith we are entitled to that inheritance, because we are *the children of God by Faith in Jesus Christ*; Gal. 3. 26. *And if children, then heirs*,

heirs, Rom. 8. 17. Yet over and above our title to it, there is required in us a suitableness to, and fitness for it. The Father of the Prodigal first embraces and kisses his poor returning son, and then puts the robe upon him, the ring on his hand, and shooes on his feet; he first pardons him, and then adorns him, and at last brings him into his house and feasts him; he fits him for his entertainment ere he brings him to it. God's pardoning a sinner is one thing, and his fully saving him is another; his receiving him into favour, and receiving him into heaven; his giving him a right to the inheritance, and giving him the actual possession of it: the first is done in a sinners justification, the other in his final salvation: but between these two comes in a third, which is God's *working* in him a fitness and meetness for that salvation, which meetness consists in a temper of spirit agreeable to, and capable of such enjoyments as are expected by, and setled upon them that are the heirs of Glory. And indeed, if we look into it we shall find, that there is not only a congruity that they who are to be made happy, should first be made holy, (in that it would be unbeseeming the wisdom and holiness of God to let them enjoy him, who never loved him; or crown them with everlasting blessedness, who never prized or sought it) but a necessity too, in that unholy souls have no capacity for true happiness, meerly natural hearts are not suited to a supernatural good; heavenly enjoyments are above the reach of sensual creatures, and the faculty, till elevated, and raised by Grace, would be so much below its object, that it could take no delight in it. Now grace or holiness in the heart, is that very temper I speak of, which makes a man capable of, and fit for glory; a supernatural principle for a supernatural happiness; and though God begins this frame, and infuseth something of this principle in the work of regeneration, yet it is further strengthened by the exercise of grace, and a course of good works, which we therefore say do fit men for Heaven by encreasing Grace in them, wherein their fitness consists. Mens abounding in good works is the way to heighten those graces from whence they proceed, and the heightning their graces is the ripening them for their glory. And though God himself, as the Author of all Grace, is the principal Agent in carrying on this work of sanctification in them, and he who doth gradually *work* them for the glory he intends them, yet they themselves having in their new birth received a new life, and new power from God, so far as they are active in the exercise of Grace, (which under him they are) so far likewise they are active in preparing themselves for Glory, and therefore deeply concerned to live in the daily exercise of good works, as the means of preparing them for it.

Luke 15.

Operatio divina necessaria est, quia mutari nos oportet, & novas Creaturas effici, priusquam participes esse possumus cœlestium beneficiorum. Nam in nobis nihil est aliud quam summa ineptitudo ad bonum spirituale sive intelligendum, sive faciendum, sive denique capiendum. Daven. *in primum ad* Coloss.

2 *Cor.* 5. 5. κατεργάζεσθαι, *rem expolire rudem, & informam*; Camero, *apud* Lxxii. κατεργάζεσθαι τὰ ξύλα. Exod. 35. 33. Jer. 31. 18, 18. *Acti agimus.*

5. Good works bear witness to the goodness of our Faith, they evidence it to be true, and of the right kind, not counterfeit, not sophisticate. And therefore we are greatly concerned to maintain good works, that thereby we may be able to assert our Faith against a quarrelling conscience, or an accusing devil, which otherwise we shall never be able to

do.

do. We acknowledg that only to be a true justifying Faith, and so of the right stamp, which *purifies the heart*, Act. 15. 9. *Works by love*, Gal. 5. 6. encourageth, and promotes, and produceth holiness, and *shews* it self by *works*, *Jam.* 2. 18. So that if Faith be the root of good works, good works are the fruit of Faith; and how then shall we know the root but by the fruit? So that as if the Devil or Conscience charge us with disobedience to God, and breach of his Law, and that therefore we are liable to the curse of the Law, we plead in our defence; that though we are not without sin, yet we are not without Faith neither; though we have offended God, yet we have believed in Christ: so if we be accused of hypocrisie, or unbelief, and told that we have not received Christ by Faith, and therefore are liable to the woe of the Gospel, we then produce our good works, a course of holiness, as the undoubted signs and evidences of the reallity and power of our Faith: and in this sense we may say, that as we our selves must be justified by our Faith, so our Faith must be justified by our works.

6. Hereby they further our assurance, and help on our comforts. The great comfort of a Believer comes in by his Faith, *Rom.* 15. 13. And therefore usually so much comfort a Christian hath, as he hath evidence of the truth and sincerity of his Faith. While it is uncertain to him whether his Faith be right, he can have little comfort in it; little *joy and peace in believing*, while he knows not whether he really believes or not. The same we may say of other Graces, so far as they conduce to the consolation of a Christian, a believer can enjoy little comfort in them, if he perpetually doubt of them; while he suspects himself to be an hypocrite, it is no marvel if he taste not the sweetness of sincerity. Now our good works (as before) give evidence to the truth of our Faith, and so likewise to the sincerity of other graces, as habits are known by their actings, and we judg what a fountain is by the streams that come from it. And therefore they that desire the comfort of Grace, must be diligent in the exercise of Grace; they that are concerned for their own peace and joy, are consequently so concerned to live, and act, as that they may attain that end. Beside, we might add, that the applause and commendation of a sanctified Conscience, upon the performance of good works, and that inward secret delight which is usually the concomitant of gracious actings, (which, so far as we are renewed, are grateful to that new nature which is within us) is no small part of a Christians pleasure, and therefore no weak inducement to diligence and constancy in such a course.

7. We are bound to the practice of good works, that so we may be conformed to God and Christ. Christ, when on earth, *went about doing good*, Act. 10. 38. He did not only abound in holiness, but activity; had not only a fulness of habitual grace in him, whereby he was always in a fitness and readiness to do good, but did continually exercise himself in it, and that he did, not only that he might fulfil the Law, but give us an

example, and so for the imitation of believers, as well as satisfaction of divine justice: We therefore are commanded, *so to walk even as he also walked*, 1 Joh. 2. 6. And the Apostle *Paul* bids us *be followers of God*, Eph. 5. 1. And *Peter*, *be holy in all manner of conversation*, (and so practically) *as he who hath called us is holy*, 1 Pet. 1. 15. And our Saviour Christ bids us *be perfect as our heavenly Father is perfect*, Matth. 5. 48. It is our perfection to be like God, not in Infiniteness, Immensity, Independency, Attributes wholly incommunicable to us, unimitable by us, but in righteousness and holiness; this was our primitive perfection in innocency, and will be our final perfection in glory; and still the more we encrease in righteousness and holiness, the more perfect we grow, because the more like God; and the more good works we do, still the more we go on in grace toward perfection and conformity to God. Men generally look on it as a desirable thing to be like God in one way or other: let but those desires be regulated, and carried toward that likeness to him, which they may attain, and ought to seek, and that will be inducement enough to the practice of good works, as the most proper means to bring them to that conformity.

8. Good works are the end of good principles. God gives us grace that we should exercise it, puts a price into our hands that we should use it. Exercise is the immediate end of habits. We are not to look upon grace as an idle quality, a dormant principle, something to lie by us, and be sluggish within us. It is not to be as a candle under a bushel, but on a candle-stick; not as mony hoarded up, but laid out. And the more we exercise it, the better, because so much the more we answer God's end in bestowing it upon us.

9. Lastly, God is most glorified by our good works, *Joh.* 15. 8. And therefore we are the more to abound in them. The more the excellency and beauty of grace appears, so much the more God is glorified, and the exercise of grace doth most of all discover the beauty of it. Holiness is but God's image, and if the image be so ravishing, what then (will men infer) is he that is resembled by it? if there be so much lustre in a beam, what is there in the Sun? Grace in the creature is but the expression or imitation of some attribute in God to which it answers, and so the more grace we act, & the more good we do, so much the more we declare what excellencies are in God, or in *Peter*'s phrase, *shew forth his virtues*, 1 Pet. 2. 9. So that good works are the most effectual way of glorifying God, because the most convincing demonstration of those perfections which are in God.

And is not here reason enough for the practice of good works? Is it nothing that God hath commanded them, that they are the way to glory, and fit us for glory, encrease grace, and discover grace, help on our comforts, and promote God's honour, unless withal we merit Heaven by them, and oblige God to reward us for them?

Qu. 2.

Qu. 2. If good works are not truly meritorious, why then, and upon what account doth God reward them?

Answ. 1. Because he hath promised so to do, and he is constant and unchangeable, and will not be worse than his word.

2. Because of the love he bears to, and the delight he takes in holiness, and those good works which are the fruits of it. *The righteous Lord loveth righteousness*, Psal. 11.7. God delights first in himself, and next in that which comes nearest to him, and most resembles him, as holiness doth, the actings of which in good works, is but the beaming out of his image in the soul; and it is not strange that God should delight in his own image. Beside that, *good works* are *God's works*, they not only resemble him, but come from him, and then well may he delight in them, and that he may shew how much he doth so, he bountifully rewards them.

3. To encourage men to the practice of them, by the hopes of the reward. Though obedience be our duty, even without consideration of the reward, yet to enliven our desires, and put more vigour into our endeavours after it, he sets the Crown in our view, and assures us that if we *abound always in the work of the Lord, our labour shall not be in vain in the Lord* 1 Cor. 15. *ult.*

Use. Something from this Doctrine we may learn for our information in the truth, and something for our instruction as to duty.

1. For the former, we see here,

1. How much the best of Saints are beholden to the Lord Jesus Christ, for purchasing life and glory for them, which, by all their good works, they could never have done, though they were a thousand times more than they are. Had not Christ made the purchase, they could never have received the inheritance: had not he laid down the price, they could never have had a title or possession. They might work their hearts out of their bodies, ere they could work their souls into Heaven. All the grace they ever have, or act in this life, could never deserve the least degree of glory they receive. So fair an Estate, so rich an Inheritance, so weighty a Crown, so transcendent a Blessedness is fit only for so great a Purchaser as the Lord Jesus Christ to buy out. They might as well purchase a Kingdom in the World with a single penny, as everlasting Glory with all their good works. What-ever title they have to a future happiness, what-ever hopes of it, what-ever rest, and peace, and joy they expect in it, they owe all to Christ, and are his debtors for all. They owe him more than a whole eternity of praises will ever recompence. How miserable would the best of Saints have been, if Christ had not merited for them? How should they ever have obtained eternal life, got a place in Heaven, or indeed have escaped everlasting burnings, had it not been for Christ's undertakings? When they had been working and labouring all their days, they would have lost their labour at last. They might have prayed, and heard, and given their goods to feed the

poor, and their bodies to feed the flames, they might have done all they could, and suffered all their enemies would, and yet have fallen short of a reward. One sin committed by them, would have done more to shut Heaven against them, than all their good works could to open it to them.

2. How unreasonable is their pride? how unpardonable is their folly that boast of, and put confidence in their own good works? That ever men should think God to be their debtor, and that they have him in bonds to them! That ever they should have such high thoughts of such pitiful things as their own works! Sure they have little knowledge of themselves that have such great conceits of themselves; know little of their ill deserts, that think they have any good ones; they have cheap thoughts of God's grace and Christ's merits, that do so magnify their own performances. *David*, and *Paul*, and all the ancient Saints were of another mind; they durst not abide God's trial, nor confront his judgment with the choicest of their works. They be-like were Saints of a lesser size, and their graces and good works of a lower allay: our Popish Saints have over-top'd them in holiness, are Giants to them: *Suarez* and *Vasquez* have got the start of *Job* and *David*, and have found out a way to Heaven unknown to all that went formerly thither. *Jacob*, poor man, counted himself *less than the least of God's mercies*, but these count themselves worthy of the greatest of them. The 24 Elders, *Rev.* 4. 10. *Cast down their Crowns* before him that sits on the Throne, in token that they had received them from him; but Papists scorn to do so, they think they have *won* them, and therefore may *wear* them; and instead of giving Glory, and Honour, and thanks to him that liveth for ever, they take them to themselves, at least share them with him. The Lord tells the Israelites, *Deut.* 9. 6. *That he gave them not that good Land to possess it for their righteousness*, speaking of the earthly *Canaan*, but these audacious merit-mongers think that even the heavenly one is given them for theirs. Great Saints no doubt they are, and well deserve to be canonized, when (if you will believe them) they deserve to be saved.

Job. 9. 15. and 40. 4. *Psal.* 143. 2. *Gen.* 32. 10.

3. And yet more egregious is their folly, in expecting advantage by the merits of others, and thinking to eke out their own righteousness by borrowing of their neighbours. If no good works of the Saints merit any thing at God's hands, then the Popish Treasury is quite empty, and his Holiness is a meer bankrupt, Supererrogations fail, Indulgences fail, and there is no borrowing from *Peter* to supply *Paul*. If the best have no merits at all, sure they have none superfluous, none to spare. The wise Virgins, *Matth.* 25. have no more oil than will serve for themselves, and are not they foolish ones that think to accommodate their friends? and they yet more foolish that hope to borrow of them? The Scripture speaks indeed of a *superfluity of naughtiness* in mens hearts, but it no-where speaks of a superfluity of goodness in their hearts

hearts or lives A redundance of merit we acknowledg in Christ, *unsearchable riches, all fulness*; but woe to them that seek for the like redundance of merit among men. Ask the old Patriarchs, and Prophets, and Apostles, to lend you some of their merits, and they will all tell you they never had any of their own, they were all beholden to Christ, and to him you must go as well as they; the Church store-house cannot furnish you.

2. For instruction in point of duty: learn hence,

1. To be humble, and acknowledge the insufficiency of all you do, to deserve any thing at God's hands. Own your selves as *unclean things*, and your *righteousness as filthy rags.* Do but study your hearts, the workings and lustings, the inclination and temper of them; study your actions and ways, the best as well as worst; your duties, and choicest services; and study God's Law, the purity, holiness, spirituality, and extensiveness of it; what it forbids, what it requires, how far it reaches, and compare both together, and then be proud if you can, boast if you can, trust in your own works if you can; and, in one word to say all, be Papists if you can. Isa. 64. 6.

2. Learn to admire the grace of God in rewarding your works: it is much that he accepts them, and what is it then that he rewards them? It is much that he doth not damn you for them, (seeing they are all defiled, and have something of sin cleaving to them) and what is it then that he crowns them? You would admire the bounty and munificence of a man, that should give you a Kingdom for taking up a straw at his foot, or give you an hundred thousand pounds for paying him a penny-rent you owed him: how then should you adore the rich grace, and transcendent bounty of God in so largely recompencing such mean services, in setting a Crown of Glory upon your heads, as the reward of those works you can scarce find in your hearts to call good ones? you will even blush one day, to see your selves so much honoured for what you are ashamed of, and are conscious to your selves you have deserved nothing by. You will wonder then to see God recompencing you for doing what was your duty to do, and what was his work in you; giving you Grace, and crowning that Grace, enabling you to do things acceptable to him, and then rewarding you as having done them. Take heed therefore now of rivalling God's grace, or Christ's merits, of inverting his praises, and ascribing any thing to your selves which belongs only to him. Set the Crown upon the right Head; let him have the honour of the work that hath done it, the glory of your reward that hath purchased it. Say with your selves, *What am I, and what are my services, that ever God should thus plentifully reward them? I never pray'd but I sinn'd, never confessed sin, never begg'd pardon of it, strength against it, but I did at the same time commit it; I never heard a Sermon, received a Sacrament, did any good duty, but with some mixture of coldness, deadness, distractedness. I never had any Grace but what God gave me,*

Cum Deus coronet merita nostra nihil aliud coronat quam munera sua. August. *contra* Pelag. *Epist.* 105.

me, nor acted any but what he ſtirr'd up in me. All the good I ever had, or did, I received from him, and therefore I owe all to him. I am a thouſand ways his debtor, for my life and being, for the good things of this life, for the means and offer of eternal life, for the knowledge of his will, conviction of ſin, reſtraint from ſin, the change of my heart, the reformation of my ways, the graces of his Spirit, the priviledges of his children conferr'd upon me: I am his debtor for all the evils he hath delivered me from, all the good he hath offered me, wrought in me, done by me. And doth God take ſo much notice of ſuch poor things? Will he indeed reward ſuch weak endeavours, ſuch lame performances? Muſt I live in Heaven, that never deſerved to live on earth? Muſt I wear the Crown of Righteouſneſs, who never deſerved any thing but the puniſhment of mine iniquities? Muſt eternal glory and honour be my portion, who have deſerved nothing better than ſhame, and everlaſting contempt? *I have nothing to boaſt of, nothing to glory in. I muſt* cry Grace, Grace. *All I have, and to eternity am to have, is Grace. The foundation of my Salvation was laid in Grace, and ſo will the top-ſtone too. It was Grace ſent Chriſt to redeem me, and Grace will ſend him at laſt fully to ſave me. I have received all from God, and therefore deſire to return the praiſe of all to him: It is but juſt that all ſhould be aſcribed to him, from whom all came.*

Zech. 4. 7.

3. Labour ſo to exerciſe your ſelves in, and to good works, as yet to put all your confidence in God's grace. I do not go about to cry down good works, or diſcourage the practice of them, but take you off from confidence in them; nor to diſſwade you from that exerciſe of holineſs whereby God may be glorified, and your ſouls advantaged, but that ſinful reliance on your own righteouſneſs, which is God's diſhonour, and your loſs. Be as holy as you will, do as much good as you will, abound as much in the work of the Lord, and walk as circumſpectly and cloſely with God as you pleaſe, (and the Lord make you abound more and more) only, if you value your comforts, if you love your ſouls, if you are concerned for God's glory, take heed of putting any the leaſt confidence in what you do, or expecting to merit a reward by your moſt laborious working. It is the great art and wiſdom of a Chriſtian to joyn the exerciſe of Faith and Holineſs together, and yet diſtinguiſh their different relations to his ſalvation; not to give ſo much to the one, as to exclude the other; but ſo to believe, as ſtill to own the uſefulneſs of works; and ſo to work, as to ſee the neceſſity of Faith: to believe like one that had no works, and to work like one that were to be ſaved by his works. In a word, to be diligent in good works, but not put confidence in them, and ſo to acknowledge their neceſſity in their place, but not their meritoriouſneſs. He is a believer of the right ſtamp, who neither contemns Chriſt's Law, nor diſhonours Chriſt's Grace, but is alike an enemy to *Antinomian* Faith, and *Antichriſtian* works.

If you do truſt in your good works, your beſt duties and ſervices; conſider that,

1. If

1. You do but lean upon a broken reed, build upon a ſandy foundation, which will at laſt fail you, diſappoint you, undo you. What a defeat will it be to expect to be ſaved by your merits, when, at laſt, it appears you have no merits; to fancy your ſelves worthy of a reward, when it appears you have been worthy of nothing? And as ſure as the Scripture is true, you can merit no more at God's hands by all your ſervices, than a debtor can of his Creditor, by paying him ſome ſmall part of what he owes him; and your very confidence in your works will bereave you of any benefit by Chriſt's merits: Chriſt alone muſt be truſted in, relied on, and glorified by you. You muſt not think to be parcel-Saviours with him; either he will be your only Saviour, or not at all your Saviour; your only righteouſneſs, or not at all your righteouſneſs: if you divide Chriſt's honour, you loſe his help; your works cannot be your righteouſneſs, and Chriſt will not; and ſo you will *loſe the things you have wrought*, by thinking to gain too much by them; miſs of the ſubſtance while you catch at the ſhadow. 2 Joh. ver. 8.

2. However you truſt in your works while you live, you will not dare to do it when you die. When men come to die, and cloſe the eyes of their bodies, uſually thoſe of their minds are moſt open, and as their reflections are then moſt ſtrong, ſo their proſpect is moſt clear. The nearer they are to death, and judgment, and eternity, the truer apprehenſions they have of them: they then beſt ſee how holy the Judge is, how impartial his ſearch, how righteous his ſentence; and how do they fear him then, with whom they made ſo bold before? How doth the confidence of their lives ſhrink at their death? Alas, they did not think either God ſo ſtrict as now they believe him, or their goodneſs ſo imperfect as now they come to find it. They ſee the neceſſity of grace, which before they ſlighted; and the inſufficiency of works, which before they idolized. Mercy is mercy indeed to a dying man, and works are but works, and not merits. Let me ſee the face of the Papiſt, that, when he is coming to the higheſt tribunal, dares truſt to his good works, and put in his claim to the Crown of Glory upon the account of his merits, and tell God to his face; *Lord, I have done all thy will, and done it as I ſhould; or if I have fallen ſhort in ſome things, I have out-done it in others: I have heard ſo many Maſſes ſaid, ſo many* Pater noſters, *and* Ave Maria's, *obſerved ſo many Canonical hours, made ſo many Confeſſions, done ſo many Penances, given ſo many Alms, gone ſo many Pilgrimages, faſted ſo many Lents, mortified my fleſh with hard lodging, and harder blows: and this is as much as Heaven is worth; thou art now a debtor to me: I have done my work, I challenge my reward, let juſtice be done me, and the Crown be given me. I ask no more than I have laboured for, and deſerved at thy hands. It is but juſt that I ſhould be joynt heir with Chriſt, ſeeing I have been joynt Purchaſer with him.* I am perſwaded there is not the Papiſt upon earth, unleſs he be moſt bruitiſhly ignorant of the Nature and Law of God, and of his own heart, that will dare in a dying hour thus to be-

ſpeak

ſpeak him. And how fooliſh is it for men to boaſt of that now, which they will not dare to boaſt of then; and build upon a foundation in their life, which they muſt be forced to relinquiſh at their death? Remember, Chriſtians, there is a time to die, as well as to live; a time to be judged in, as well as to act in; a day of recompence, as well as a day of ſervice: and therefore bethink your ſelves before-hand; ſee your confidence be rightly placed. Expect your ſalvation from him only now, from whom you will expect it at laſt; and put your ſouls into his hands now, into whoſe you would then moſt willingly commit them: ſet aſide your works, though not as to the practice of them, yet as to your confidence in them. Eye Chriſt alone as to the buſineſs of your juſtification, acceptance, reward. Labour for ſuch a Faith in Chriſt, and free Grace, as will ſupport you under the weakneſs and imperfections of your preſent righteouſneſs, and encourage you againſt the terrors of approaching death. In a word, ſo believe and hope now, that you are going on toward Eternity, as you would do when you are ſtepping into it.

SERM.

SERMON XII.

The Doctrine of Juſtification is dangerouſly corrupted in the Roman Church.

Mr David Clarkson

Rom. 3. 24. *Being juſtified freely by his Grace, through the Redemption that is in Jeſus Chriſt.*

THE Apoſtle, in theſe words, (and the following) gives an exact account of the Doctrine of Juſtification, dictated to him by the Spirit of Truth. And this will be the beſt ground we can proceed on, to diſcover the errors by which it is corrupted. That is our preſent buſineſs to which I haſten, only firſt opening the words by a brief touch upon them.

Being juſtified] To be juſtified, is to be freely accepted of God as righteous, ſo as to have pardon and title to life, upon the account of Chriſt's righteouſneſs. We cannot be accepted as righteous, till we be acquitted from guilt. The Apoſtle deſcribes Juſtification by remiſſion of ſins, *Rom.* 4. 5, 6. And being accepted as righteous, we are accepted to life. (The Apoſtle calls it *Juſtification of Life*, Romans 5. 17, 18, 21.) This is upon the account of Chriſt's righteouſneſs. We cannot be juſtified upon our own account; for ſo we are condemned, and cannot but be ſo, nor upon other account but Chriſt and his righteouſneſs; for there's no juſtification without righteouſneſs; and none ſufficient but that of Chriſt, which the Apoſtle includes in the Redemption that is in Chriſt Jeſus.

Freely by his Grace] The Lord juſtifies by his Grace, and this acts freely. That which moves him is called, *Tit.* 3. 4. χρηστότης φιλανθρωπία, Kindneſs and Love, which, *ver.* 7. is Grace; (that being juſtified, τῇ ἐκείνου χάριτι, by his Grace) ſo Juſtification is χάρισμα, the free gift, *Rom.* 5. 16. δωρεὰν ἐν χάριτι, the gift by grace, *ver.* 15. This grace, as it is free mercy, ſo it acts like it ſelf, δωρεὰν, freely, (the word uſed, *Mat.* 10. 8. δωρεὰν ἐλάβετε, freely ye have received it) he gives it freely to thoſe who have no merit to deſerve it: there is none in us; what there was, was in Chriſt. It is

Through the Redemption.] Redemption is deliverance by a price, or valuable conſideration. This price was the bloud of Chriſt *ver.* 25.

Rom. 5. 9. *Eph.* 1. 6, 7. His death, *Rom.* 8. 33, 34. His obedience, *Rom.* 5. 19. His righteousness, *ver.* 18.

We may view the Text distinctly in three parts.

1. Believers are justified.

2. Freely by his Grace.

3. Through the Redemption that is in Christ.

Against each of these the Papists have advanced several errors of pernicious consequence; and thereby dangerously corrupted the whole Doctrine of Justification.

1. That a sinner may be saved, the Scriptures declare that he must be both justified and sanctified: the Romanists, as if one of those were but requisite, call that Justification, which in Scripture is Sanctification; and that which in Scripture is Justification, they admit not, as distinct from inherent righteousness.

The Apostle *Paul*, who most insists upon the Doctrine of Justification, delivers these two as distinct things, 1 *Cor.* 11. and else-where. He ascribes Justification commonly to the bloud of Christ, as in the Text, and *Rom.* 5. 8, 9. Sanctification to the Spirit of Christ, *Tit.* 3. 5.

However the Papists promiscuous use of the words might be tollerated, if they did not confound the things, and contend that we are formally justified by that which is the form and essence of Sanctification, *viz.* inherent righteousness. The danger is that which the Apostle would have the Jews avoid, when he expresseth his hearty desire that they might be saved; *Rom.* 10. 13. *For they being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves to the righteousness of God.* The Papists trust to their own righteousness for acceptance and life, and will be justified, in the sight of God, by that which indeed is imperfect and culpable, and so liable to be condemned; and being convinced that they cannot be justified by an imperfect righteousness, therefore they will have their inherent righteousness to be perfect, *a* not so perfect as it will be in Heaven, but so as to be free from *b* sin, and to answer the demands of the Law, since they know otherwise it would not justifie them. And this fancy of a sinless perfection runs them into many absurd and pernicious conceits.

a Quod dicebamus-- justitiam & charitatem in hac vita non esse perfectam comparatione duntaxat ad illam patriæ reputandum est. Domenicus a Soto de nat. & grat. L. 3. cap. 4. p. 134.

b The Council of *Trent* calls it *Justitiam candidam & immaculatam, Sess.* 5. 67. In the *Trent* Catechism it is *Divina qualitas in anima inhærens-- quæ animarum vestrarum omnes maculas delet ea (charitas) siquidem, est verissima, plenissima, perfectissima, justitia*; Bellarm. *de Justif.* L. 2. c. 16. p. 806.

For they are hereby obliged to maintain, that no corruption in their natures, (after Baptism) no aversion to God, no inclination to evil, though habitual and fixed, has any thing of sin in it. No, nor any *c* vicious ha-

c Habitus justitiæ contrarius est habitus injustitiæ, quia non est peccatum sed vitium, ex malis actibus contractum, quale etiam in justificatis

tis reperiri potest, ibid. p. 805. *Dispositio vel habitus acquisitus Vitium est, non peccatum, de amiss. grat.* L. 5. c. 19. p. 337. *Omnes siquidem leges præcipiunt vel prohibent actus non habitus.* Melch. Canus *de pœnit.* p. 870.

bits acquired by frequent acts of sin; all is sinless that is in the soul, when Grace or Charity is once therein. And so there's no need of mortification, no possibility of it: for there is nothing of sin in them to be mortified, no habit or disposition, natural or accessary, upon which the charge of sin can be truly fixed. And as they leave no need of, no place for mortification; so after they have discarded the Scripture Justification, to make way for a Sanctification to justifie them; they deal no better with that neither. Whether it be taken for the first rise of Holiness, which is properly regeneration; or for the growth and increase of it, which is the Sanctification that the Scripture calls for commonly under this notion (they will have it to be a second Justification). As for the first Sanctification, by their principles, it excludes all sin, and is, so far, perfect or nothing, and so indeed it is a meer *chimæra*, such a thing as God never gave, never promised, as no meer man on earth ever had; *Job.* 1. 18. Yet this and nothing else must justifie them, and make them worthy of eternal life: and thus they will be justified, and saved by a meer fancy, or nothing.

As for growth and increase in Holiness, (which is the Sanctification that the Scripture makes so necessary, and calls for with so much importunity) this they make superfluous and unnecessary. No man needs design or endeavour it; for what needs he look after more of that which he hath already in *d* perfection? They have it in such perfection, as there is no culpable defect in it; it is no sin to have no more, (else it would not be sufficient to their Justification) and what necessity is there to labour for that which it is no sin to want? Their Doctrine of Justification by a righteousness of their own inculpably perfect, obliges them to hold, that what Grace they receive at first, though in the very lowest degree, is all that God commands, and makes necessary (if he commanded more, the want of more would be culpable). So that every degree of Holiness or Charity above the least of all, is only *e*, *sub consilio*, meer matter of counsel; which they may neglect without contracting so much as the guilt of a *f* venial fault.

d *Nulla enim est charitas simpliciter imperfecta -- sufficit autem quilibet gradus charitatis ut quis servet verbum*, i. e. *præcepta Domini*, Bellarm. *de Purgat.* 22. c. 3. p. 1381.

e *Si non pecco (ex sententia S.* Thomæ*) si amem Deum nisi uno gradu amoris, certe non teneor in rigore amplius amare: implicat enim contradictionem, quod non peccem, non faciendo quod facere teneor: ergo si addam alterum gradum amoris, amo plus, quam teneor, atq; eo modo facio actum supererrogationis, ut Consil.* Bellarm. *de Monach.* L. 2. c. 13. p. 1162.

f *Nec ullæ (leges) divinæ consultoriæ etiam ad veniale obligent.* Navar. *manual.* C. 23. n. 49. p. 564. & c. 21. n. 43. Silvest. *sum. verbum inobed. Ss.* 2.

Thus all progress in holiness is hereby superceded: after the first step they sin not, though they never make another. And all the de-

grees of holiness above the lowest, are unnecessary, they may be without all of them, safely and inculpably. In short, if the want of all other degrees, but the least of all, be a sin; if the lowest degree of all be not righteousness in perfection: by their principles, they are not justified, and cannot be saved; and so the main stress of their Salvation lies upon a gross and palpable delusion; that such a righteousness is perfect, as is furthest of all from perfection, and in a degree next to nothing.

Secondly, they seem to include remission of sins in Justification, but it is not that pardon which the Gospel offers, but another thing under the disguise of the same word. And particularly, such as lies cross to every part of the Text. Their pardon is not an act of God, absolving a guilty person upon the account of satisfaction given; but an act *g* or consequent of infused Grace or Charity within us, abolishing sin, and not otherwise taking away the guilt, but by taking away the being of it.

g *Charitas culpam delet per actum suum proprium, pœnam autem tollet per opera satisfactoria quæ ipsa charitas imperat*, Bellarm. *de Purgat.* Lib. 2. c. 3. p. 1381.

The best account I can give of it, in brief, is this, collected out of their chief Authors. They observe in sin the fault and the guilt; and the guilt either as it is the desert of sin, and the offender worthy of punishment; or, as it is an obligation to punishment, and the sinner bound to suffer it. The former is, with them, *h reatus culpæ*; the latter, *reatus pœnæ*: and all this is taken away by Charity, or infused Grace. *i* The fault in sin is the *aversion*, or the souls turning away from God: but Charity, or inherent Grace, brings it back again, and joyns it to him, and thereby the fault is remitted. Now the fault being gone, by vertue of inherent Grace, the guilt must vanish too: for where there is no fault, there is no desert of punishment; and where there is no desert of it, there can be no obligation to it. So that infused Grace having left sin no being, by necessary *k* consequence the guilt is taken away together with it. Accordingly *Bellarmine* shews particularly how this Charity takes away all that belongs to sin, the aversion from God, the stain of sin, the desert of punishment, and the obligation to it: and the sum of all is this. *l* The formal effect of habitual Charity is the abolishing of sin: and with him and others, remission of sins, and infusion of Grace, are but one and the same *m* motion; whereof these are the two terms; as it is in the diffusion of light, and the dispelling of darkness.

h *Reatus culpæ, qui est dignitas odii, indignitas gratiæ, & meritum pœnæ: Reatus pœnæ, id est ordinatio sive obligatio ad luendam pœnam*, Bellarm. *de amiss. grat.* L. 5. c. 19. p. 337.

i *Quando per gratiam remittitur culpa tollitur aversio animæ a deo in quantum per gratiam anima Deo conjungitur.* Aquinas 3. q. 85. *art.* 4. *Ideo ex hoc dicitur culpa mortalis remitti quod per gratiam tollitur aversio mentis a Deo, ad primum artic.* 4. *quest.* 85.

k *Per consequens simul tollitur reatus pœnæ, id. ibid. non possunt, non tolli, si donum illud præcesserit*; says *Bellarmine* of the guilt and offence of sin, *de Justific.* L. 12. c. 16. p. 806.

l *Habemus primum effectum formalem justitiæ, id est Charitatis habitualis, divinitus infusæ, esse de medio tollere, ac delere peccatum, id. ibid.*

m *Id. ibid*, L. 2. c. 2. p. 766. And *Soto* (after *Aquinas*) *de nat. & grat.* L. 2. c. 18. p. 110.

So

So that this Doctrine leaves ſinners no hopes of pardon in this life, or for ever: for hereby ſin is not pardoned, till by inherent Charity it be quite expelled, which is not in this life: or till the ſinner be rendred not worthy of puniſhment, meerly by vertue of ſuch Charity, which will never be.

However, thoſe who underſtand what pardon is, by the light of Scripture will ſoon diſcover that this is not the Goſpel-pardon; to go no farther than the Text, it claſhes (as I ſaid) with every part of it. For, firſt, by their account, Pardon is by a phyſical, or ſuper-phyſical act of Charity within us: whereas the firſt word in the Text, (δικαιόμενοι). ſhews that pardon in Juſtification is a judicial act of God towards us. The perpetual uſe of the word in Scripture aſſures us of this: it implies a judicial proceeding, and is ſet oppoſite to condemning or accuſing. For a Judge to acquit one at the Barr, accuſed in order to condemnation, is not to qualifie him, (that would be to prevent miſdemeanors for the future) but to diſcharge from what he is accuſed of, as paſt: nor can they give any inſtances in Scripture of ſuch uſe of the word as will bear their notion. Indeed, it is againſt the uſage of the World, and common ſenſe, that a man ſhould be ſaid to pardon one, by indueing him with good qualities. Secondly, the pardon in Juſtification is free. A gift of undeſerved Grace (as the next words expreſs it). But their pardon is not free, neither in it ſelf, nor in that which they make the riſe of it (*inherent Charity*). They deface the freeneſs of it in both, by a conceit of their own merit; and ſo transform it into another thing than the pardon of the Goſpel is, which ſhall be made apparent when we come to the ſecond part of the Text. Thirdly, the Goſpel-pardon is intirely through the redemption that is in Chriſt (as the next words repreſent it): But their pardon excludes this redemption, or leaves it but a minute and remote influence into it, if any at all.

The Lord, by Chriſt's undertaking, is moved to ſhew mercy to ſinners; he ſhews it by infuſing Charity into their hearts, this takes away the fault or being of ſin, and that being gone, the deſert of puniſhment vaniſheth, and by conſequence the obligation to it. So we muſt paſs ſeveral ſtages before we can diſcover what the redemption of Chriſt hath to do in the pardon of a ſinner; and when we have gone ſo far, may be at a loſs too, as they order the matter: but that will better be ſhewed in the laſt propoſal.

Moreover, though they will have their pardon do more than meer remiſſion can do; yet they make it fall ſhort of that which is moſt proper for pardon to do. It quite diſſolves not the obligation to puniſhment,

Pœna damni eſt maxima pœnarum,-- Omnis qui in purgatorio degit, cruciatur ſaltem hac pœna damnî quæ eſt omnium maxima, Aquinas *in* 4 *Diſt.* 20. 41. *art.* 2. *vid.* Bellarm. *de Purgat.* L. 2. c. 14. *Si ibi eſt verus ignis, erit omnino acerrimus; cum ad hoc ſolum ſit inſtitutus, ut ſit inſtrumentum juſtitiæ divinæ; ſi non ſit ignis verus, erit aliquid horribilius, quale Deus parare potuit, qui potentiam ſuam in hoc oſtendere voluit,* p. 1400.

ment, but leaves the sinner, when he is said to be pardoned, to suffer, as if he were condemned. He must, for all his pardon, be damned to a temporary hell, (for such is their Purgatory) and there he must be punished in the severest manner and measure, with the greatest suffering of all, *as to loss* (the want of the vision and fruition of God) and the most exquisite tortures, *as to sense*, *o* such as are equivalent to the torments of hell; and all this it may be for 100 or 1000 years, they know not how long. All the pardoning mercies of God, and the redemption of Christ, *p* cannot secure him from this. Sure this pardon looks nothing so like remission, as condemnation.

o Nam ut recte explicat Card. Cajetanus pœna illa quæ luenda restat post culpæ remissionem est illa ipsa pœna sensus, quam in Gehenna pati debuisset peccator, remota solum æternitate Idem de pœnit.

p The Pope (sure his Holiness has left him no mercy) can do it when he list; Silvest. *sum.* v. *Papa* q 6. *si quæratur verum possit spoliare Purgatorium pro libito suo: dico quod non voluntate sua precise sed mediante illo infinito thesauro* But he is wise however, and considers if he should spoil Purgatory, he would spoil something else, which is more regarded at *Rome* than another World.

Thirdly, what we said last, respects those sins which they call mortal; but there is with them another sort of sins which go under the notion of venials, and which in number exceed the other vastly and incomparably. And these sins by their Doctrine are not pardoned, or need no pardon; and so Justification, the free Grace of God, and the redemption of Christ, are excluded hereby, as needless, and unconcerned in them.

The pardon in Justification frees the sinner from eternal punishment; but they teach, that these sins (all of them together) deserve not eternal punishment: *q* God cannot justly inflict it for them. It is not due to them. If the guilt of all the sins in the World, of this sort, were charged upon one man; or if there were no covenant or promise of God for pardon, says their great Cardinal, (*i. e.* if there were no Gospel, no Christ) yet a sinner could not be punished for them eternally. So that there is no place for, no need of the pardon of the Gospel as to these sins. Then for the temporal punishment of them, the sinner either must, or may suffer it himself, and so satisfy for it: if he *may* satisfie for it, there's no need of pardon: if he *do* satisfie for it, there is no place for pardon. He that suffers what punishment the Law will have inflicted for his offence, neither is nor can be said to be pardoned. *r* So that plainly by their Doctrine, venial sins have not, or need not pardon of any sort, either in respect of eternal or temporal punishment.

q Negamus — posse Deum juste punire peccatum quodlibet etiam veniale, pœna omnium gravissima quæ est mors æterna. Bellarm. *de amiss. grat.* L. 1. c. 14. p. 92. *etiamsi omnia peccata venialia, simul colligerentur in unum, nunquam efficerent id, quod facet unum Lethale id, ibid.* C. 13. p. 91. *Etiamsi nullum esset pactum Dei nobiscum de remissione pœnæ adhuc tamen perspicuum esset, peccatum veniale ex sua natura non inducere reatum pœnæ sempiternæ id, ibid.* C. 4. p. 95.

r Non enim remittitur quod totaliter punitur, Bellarm. *de Purgat.* L. 1. c. 7. p. 1359.

And

And yet these venial sins, which need no pardon, are many of them for their quality, great and heinous; for their number, far the greatest of all. As to their quality; their Casuists (who are dictators in this business) make what sins they list to be venial. Whereas, by their common reckoning, there are seven mortal sins; even divers of these, by their handling, are shrunk into small faults. They make *f* covetousness and prodigality two, *t* ambition, *u* vain-glory, *x* gluttony and *y* drunkenness, (if it do but half bruitifie a man,) *z* the neglect of the publick worship of God, (of all worship indeed which can be truly called so,) and the *a* neglect of charity and mercy to men; (except in such cases which rarely or never fall out;) *b* also common swearing, *c* great irreverence to the Divine Majesty, *d* abhorring of divine things, yea divers sorts of *e* blasphemy *f* and perjury, *g* murder, with others of like nature to be but venial faults. They assign several waies wherein the highest impieties against God, and greatest out-rages to men, may pass under this gentle notion, and so need no pardon. This might be clearly shewed, out of the writings of the leading men amongst them, of several orders, and such as have the chief conduct of their consciences, (though the Jesuites were left out), but it requires a large discourse, and I must not here digress a little.

f Aquinas 22. q. 118 *art.* 4. *Navar. Enchir.* C. 23. n. 18. *t* Cajetan. *sum. verb. ambitio. u* Aquinas *ibid.* q. 132. *art.* 3. x Cajetan. *ibid.* v. *gula*, & v. *emunditia.* y *Navar. ibid.* C. 13. *n.* 2. & C. 21. *n.* 1. z *Id.* C. 14. *n.* 5. Cajetan. *ibid.* v *eleemosyn. a* Lopez *instruct. consc.* C. 42. p. 227. & Sylvest. *sum.* v *juramen.* 2. 48. *b* Jacob *de* Graff *decis. aur.* L. 2. c. 52. *n.* 10. *c* Sylvest. *ibid.* v. *malitia*, p. 170. *d Id ibid.* v. *blasphem.* q. 3. 4. *Domina soto de just. & jur.* L. 8. q. 2. *art.* 3. p. 269, 270. d *Id ibid.* L. 5. q. 1. *art.* 8.

And, as these sort of sins are great otherwise, so, that they are the greatest of all for number, is no question. Their Church enjoyns but confession once a year, and presumes that any wicked person may give an account, in a little while, to his Confessor, of the mortal sins he commits in a whole year: but of venial sins no account can be given, being so numerous, that they are beyond remembrance or notice. So that by their Doctrine there are very few sins, in comparison, that need pardon, and so few, that need either the free Grace of God, or the redemption that is in Jesus Christ. These corruptions are dangerous and evidently damnable; I have insisted the longer thereon, because in this point (about pardon) the Romanists are conceived to come neerer the truth and us than I fear they do indeed.

Proceed we now to the second part of the Text, (*freely by his Grace,*) When the Lord justifies a sinner, he does it most freely. It's an act of meer Grace; it's no way due to us before he vouchsafe it. He owes it not, but gives it, when he is no way pre-ingaged by any desert in us. Merit in us is utterly inconsistent with this gracious act. These two are opposite in their nature; and the Apostle plainly expresses the opposition, *Rom.* 11. 6. and 4. 4. If it be due by vertue of any act or work of ours, it is debt; if it be debt, it is not grace, the grace of God herein is no grace. *If by grace, then it is no more of works, otherwise grace is no more grace;*

grace; but if it be of works, then it is no more grace, &c. Now to him that worketh, is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt. The Apostle's discourse cannot be answered with reason, nor evaded with any conscience. And yet the Papists will presumptuously croud merits of all sorts into Justification. And by this means too, they corrupt this Doctrine dangerously and intollerably: they do it against all evidence of Scripture; they do it to the foul defacing of the glory of *free grace*, and the *redemption of Christ*: they do it with great hazard to their own souls. For if they will not be justified freely, if they will stay till they deserve it, they are like to be condemned. Yet they will venture, and stick not to ascribe all that they include in their several justifications to some sort of merit. Inherent grace, and pardon of sin, to *congruous* merit; title to glory, and increase of Grace, (which they make a second justification) to merit of *condignity*.

Nec esset gratia, si non daretur gratuita, sed debita redderetur, Aug. *Epist.* 105.

Aquinas himself, *Manifestum est quod omne meritum repugnat gratiæ quia ut Apostolus*, Rom. 11. 1, 2. *q.* 4. *art.* 56.

Inherent (which they call justifying) grace, and count it (after the *a* Council of *Trent*) unanimously the formal cause of justification, by their Doctrine, falls under merit. They mince it indeed, calling it merit of congruity, but it is big enough, how small so-ever they would have it seem, to bid defiance to the grace of God in the Text.

a *Sess. 6. Cap. 7.*

There are some preparatory works which (they say) must go before Justification *b* as dogmatical Faith; some sorrow for sin, fear, hope, *&c.* to which justifying is due in congruity, though not in justice; and this duness they express in the definition of congruous merit. It is, says *Navar.* (after *Aquinas* and their common gloss) c *a good humane act, of one without the grace of God to which spiritual or temporal reward is in some respect and congruity due.* Now if justifying grace be due on our account, before the Lord vouchsafe it; he gives it not freely, but only pays what he owes, and is before obliged by us to let us have; *d* and *Bellarmine* says this merit is not founded on the promise of God, but in the worth and dignity of the work.

b *Vid. Concil.* Trident. *Sess. 6. c. 6.*

c *Est actus humanus bonus factus ab aliquo, extra gratiam Dei existente, cui de quadam congruitate, & secundum quid debetur aliqua merces spiritualis vel temporalis, ut sentit glossa. Enchirid. præ'u l. 7. n. 3. p. 40.*

d *Quod objiciebatur, meritum de congruo non fundari in dignitate operis sed sola promissione Dei, respondemus, contrarium esse verum*; and a little after, *Nos existimamus potius fundari meritum de congruo, in aliqua dignitate operis, quam in promissione. De Justific. L. 1 c 21. p. 753.*

This sort of merit is generally owned by the Romanists. e *Soto* tells us it is asserted by *Scotus*, *Durandus*, *Adrian*, and in a manner all the School Doctors, whom they call *Nominals*, (and this is one division of their Schools). He *f* says also, that *Aquinas* (the leader of the other

e *De natura & grat. L. 2. c. 3. p. 65. & Medina*, 12. *q.* 109.

f *Cum St. Thomas*, 2 *Sent. d.* 27, 28. *Opinionem communem insequutus affirmasset tum quod homo ex naturalibus posset se disponere ad gratiam, tum quod dispositio illa esset meritum de congruo.* Soto *ibid. p. 66.*

division)

division) following the common opinion, affirms it likewise, though he would have us think that he afterwards retracted it. But *Bellarmine* [g] not acknowledging any such retraction, together with *Aquinas*, reckons up to us, by name, the chief of the Schoolmen as of this persuasion.

[g] *Magister sententiarum, St.* Thomas, Bonaventur, Scotus, Durandus, Gabriel, and others, *de penitentia, lib. 2. c. 12. pag. 945.*

S. Clara tells us it is *certe communis et recepta sententia Scholarum Dens natura grat. Problem. 21. P. 125.*

It's true, there is some difference among them about the name: Some would not have it called *Congruous Merit*; but all, as *i Bellarmin*, *k Vega*, and after him *l Sancta Clara* tells us, agree in the thing. And it is the thing, not the word that is so injurious to the Grace of God, and wherein the corruption and the danger lies, and therein they conspire.

[i] *Quod attinet ad catholicos, quæstio videtur esse fere de solo nomine meriti, &c. de justif. c. 20. l. 1. c. 21. P. 752.* [k] *Recte advertit Vega, de re, non est inter Doctores catholicos quæstio de nomine solum est quæstio an ea debeant vocari meritum de congruo* Sancta Clara, *ibid. P. 1129.* Itaq;

I need bring no particular testimonies, to shew, that by their Doctrine, pardon of sin falls under this sort of merit: For pardon and inherent Grace are by them involved together, and made one and the same motion; and I have staid the longer on that which is evidence for both, because some question, whether this congruous merit be commonly owned by their Writers. I think it might as well be questioned, Whether the proper merit of condignity be their common doctrine; for there are some among them who dislike this, and scarce more the other, so far as I can compute the numbers.

As for the other particulars (Title to glory) included in the first, and increase of Grace, which they call a second Justification, the Council of *Trent* has made it an Article of their Faith, That good works are truly meritorious of both, and denounceth those accursed who deny it; and their Writers unanimously since understand it to be merit of condignity, as [o] *Aquinas* expresst it before. So that these things are due from God upon the account of their Good works in strict Justice, and not alone in congruity. It is not my business to argue against their Doctrine of merit, only let me suggest this which the Text leads me to.

[o] *Quum justus homo per opera sua bona quatenus movente Deo facta sunt, vitam æternam de condigno meretur, ipsum etiam gratiæ et charitatis augmentum mereri dicendum est, 12. q. 114. art. 8.*

Their opinion of merit makes the special Grace and mercy of God needless: For if a man by what he doth can make heaven due from God in point of Justice, he needs not his Mercy to save him, so long as he is sure the Lord will not be unjust; he is not concerned to regard whether or not he be gracious and merciful. As in a like case, when a mans cause requires nothing but Justice, if he be sure the Judg will do him Justice, there is no need at all to be beholding to him for his mercy. Thus Grace and Mercy being excluded as needless and superfluous, all obligements to love and gratitude, to all ingenuous obedience and worship, are taken off, and all sense of Religion like to be razed out of the souls of

men. I may forbear telling you that this is of dangerous tendency.

Come we to the third part of the Text, The Justification of a sinner is, *Through the Redemption that is in Jesus Christ.*

That Doctrine quite overthrows the Justification of a sinner, which removes from it this redemption; but so doth the Popish Doctrine, and thereby tends to make Christ of none effect. For without that redemption, he is not, he cannot be the Saviour of any man. Their errors here strike deep, and tend to undermine the foundation of Christianity. Let me give you an account hereof in respect of the satisfaction, the merit, and the application of this redemption.

1. The satisfaction of Christ is unnecessary, by their Doctrine, there is no need of it for the justifying of a sinner; he may be pardoned and freed from eternal punishment without it. For if the pardon of sin be the abolishing, and utter extinguishing of it, as they teach, *p* and it be by infused Grace or charity, that sin is thus abolished, as dark *r* by the approach of light, and one contrary by natural consequence, at the presence of another (which is their Doctrine, if I understand it); then there was no more requisite to free a sinner from guilt and liableness to eternal punishment, but only that Christ should purchase for him habitual grace. Now to purchase this, his merit would serve, and there would be no need of satisfaction *s*. And there are those who seem to acknowledg the former, when they deny the latter.

p *Bellarmine de Justif. lib. 2. c. 7. P. 783. initio. Dicere Deum peccata remittere, non tamen prorsus tollere, nominis est vocem remissionis ignorantis. Soto de nat. et grat. lib. 2. c. 19. P. 113. Omnino idem plane valet, peccata esse tecta; atque sublata esse, et nulla prorsus relicta. Pererius disput. 3. in Rom. 4. Admonemus (peccata) dimitti esse, non solum non imputari, non solum non puniri; Sed penitus etiam tolli, penitus scelerii, Maldonat. in Mat. 6.12. p. 145.* r *Quo fit ut gratia gratum faciens ex diametro opponitur peccato atque adeo formaliter per modum contrarietatis expellat ipsum ut author est, S. Tho. 12. q. 113. art. 2. Soto ibid. p. 109. Bellar. ibid. c. 2. p. 766.* s *Aliquod meritum est sine satisfactione et e contrario, id. de Purgat. lib. 1. c. 10. p. 1370.*

Then as to the temporal punishment, they leave no place at all for Christ's satisfaction; this is quite excluded here, (though this punishment be no less in their account than the torments of hell, eternity excepted): the sinner must, or may, satisfie for himself, and therefore Christ did not satisfie: otherwise the Lord would take payment twice for one debt, and require double satisfaction for every sin, and punish it *ultra demeritum*, more than it deserves, which would be cruelty: yea he would not be satisfied when he had satisfaction, which would be unreasonable. Nor is this my inference only, they do as good as acknowledge it: For they grant that Christ did not satisfie for *t* temporal punishment,

t *Satisfacit mediate pro pœna etiam temporali quatenus gratiam præbet per quam ipsi nos Domino satisfacimus,* Bellarm. *de pœnitentia, L.4. c.15.p.1076. & de Purgat.l.1.c.10. non quod immediate ipsa ejus satisfactio tollet pœnam temporalem nobis debitam, sed quod mediate eam tollat, quatenus videlicet, ab ea gratiam habemus, sine qua nihil valeret nostra satisfactio; p. 1369*

nishment,

niſhment, but mediately; by procuring grace for ſinners, that they might ſatisfie for themſelves. And if he ſatisfied no otherwiſe, he ſatisfied not at all; no more than I can be ſaid to travel 100 miles, when I do not ſtir out of doors, becauſe I help another to a horſe, who performs ſuch a journey.

Thus, by their Doctrine of Juſtification and Pardon, the redemption of Chriſt, as to ſatisfaction made thereby, is reduced in a manner to nothing. For venial ſins, to which, they ſay, temporal puniſhment only is due; they cannot with any reaſon pretend that ſatisfaction by him is neceſſary. For mortal ſins, (a ſmall parcel of the infinite multitude of venials conſidered), habitual grace (which Chriſt might merit, though he did not ſatisfie) is ſufficient to aboliſh fault and guilt, and ſo to procure remiſſion, as to eternal ſuffering.

Or, if habitual Grace were not ſufficient for this, yet ſtill they make the redemption of Chriſt inſufficient, and ſo no ſatisfaction. For notwithſtanding all that he hath done and ſuffered, the Lord is not appeaſed to thoſe that believe; he will puniſh, he will inflict the torment of hell, for a time at leaſt; how long, none of them can tell; but, without queſtion, (they ſay) till his juſtice be ſatisfied, till that be done by themſelves, which Chriſt alone can do, and that will be long indeed, and not end but with eternity. So that it is plain by their principles, that the Lord is not yet ſatisfied by the redemption of Chriſt? it was not as much as juſtice required, it was not enough, and ſo could not be ſatisfaction. And therefore *a Bellarmine* concludes ſuitably enough to their principles; that of the ſeveral opinions which are amongſt them concerning Chriſt's ſatisfaction and mans: this is the moſt probable, that there is no actual ſatisfaction but one only, and this is ours.

a *Tertius tamen modus videtur probabilior, quod una tantum ſit actualis ſatisfactio, & ea ſit noſtra, de Purgat. L. 1. c. 10. p. 1069.*

2. The merit of this redemption is alſo by their Doctrine made unneceſſary for the purchaſing of eternal life, to which we are accepted in Juſtification; for they teach that men may (and muſt, if they will have it) merit it for themſelves. Now there is no need of the merit of redemption, if men can, and do merit Heaven; for merit is the worth of what it is ſaid to deſerve, it muſt be (by their computation) c equal or proportionable in value to it. Now if Chriſt bring the worth of Heaven, and we muſt bring the worth of it too; the Lord lets none have Heaven till he have double the value of it, till he receive twice as much for it as it is worth: ſo that Heaven, upon this account, will be a very hard bargain, however the Lord declares it to be a gift.

c *In obere bono ex gratia procedente ſit quædam proportio & æqualitas ad præmium vitæ æternæ*, Bellarm. *de Juſtific. L. 5. c. 17. Æqualem valorem condignitatis habent*, Vaſquez.

There is no avoiding this, but either by making the merit of Chriſt needleſs, or the merits of men. The Papiſts in this caſe chooſe rather to make the merit of redemption unneceſſary. And indeed, (when they think it adviſable to ſpeak out) they ſay expreſly that there is no

need of the merit of Christ, that we may; thus *Vasquez* (one of their most eminent writers) *d* seeing the merits of a just man (saith he) do condignly merit eternal life, as an equal recompence and reward; there is no need that any other condign merit, such as is the merit of Christ, should intervene that eternal life may be had. But how then must we understand them, when they tell us that Christ did merit eternal life for us? They inform us by their Doctrine of Satisfaction: as Christ satisfied for the temporal punishment due to sin mediately, by procuring grace to satisfie for it our selves: so he purchased life for us mediately, *e* in that he was worthy to obtain grace for us, whereby we merit life our selves. But, by this account, he did not merit life for us at all, no more than he can be said to confess or repent of our sins; because he obtained grace for us to confess and repent thereof our selves. This is but to own the merit of redemption, as *a Pelagius* owned the grace of God; when he said it was grace, for him to form us with wills able to act sufficiently, and perform the office of grace without it.

d *Cum opera justi mereantur vitam æternam tanquam æqualem mercedem & præmium: non opus est interventu alterius meriti condigni, quale est meritum Christi, ut eis reddatur vita æterna, in prima secundæ, q.* 114. *Disput.* 222. *c.* 3. *n.* 30.

e *Nunquam petimus a Deo per merita Christi ut nostris dignis operibus & meritoriis reddatur merces æternæ vitæ: sed ut per Christum detur nobis gratia, qua possemus digne hanc mercedem promereri, id. ibid.* They use this illustration; A Farm being given to a son he may by the commodities reaped out of that Farm, buy any thing that it shall please his Father to set to sale. *D.* Bishop in Abbot of merits. P. 640.

a They said (as *Augustine* represents them) *Posse sufficere naturam humanam quæ condita est cum libero arbitrio: eamque esse Dei gratiam, quia sic conditi sumus, ut hoc voluntate possimus. De gestis contr.* Pelag. *c.* 35. And *Jerom, ad Ctesiphontem, p.* 253. *Ita Dei gratiam ponunt, ut non per singula opera, ejus nitamur & regamur auxilio, sed ad liberum referent arbitrium, ut in eo Deo referendæ sint gratiæ, quod talis nos condiderit, qui nostro arbitrio possimus & eligere bona, & vitare mala: & non intelligunt ista dicentes quod per os eorum intollerabilem blasphemiam Diabolus sibilet.*

Besides, secondly, their principles do not allow them to say, that we have inherent grace by the merit of Christ. And that being with them the formal cause of Justification; if it was not procured for us by his redemption, this is quite excluded from being interessed in justifying us. And indeed all the interest of Christ's redemption in our justification (and salvation too) is reduced by them to this one point, *his purchasing inherent grace for us*, (as appears by the premises). So that if this be disclaimed, there will be nothing ascribed to Christ.

Now it cannot be expected, that while they profess themselves Christians, they should, in plain terms, make Christ a Cipher; but they do it by consequence too plainly. Their other principles render Christ's meriting inherent grace for us, to be needless: and sure he would not do and suffer so much for a needless thing. By their Doctrine of congruous merit, a man destitute of inherent, (or (as they call it) justifying) grace, may do that which will make it due to him from God. Now that which a man can make due to himself, needs not at all the merit

of

of Christ to make it due. The Lord will certainly let him have his due, without the mediation of any other merit.

Yea, if we should bate the word merit & *debitum*, or duness too, (as *Soto* would have it); yet if a man can do that upon which justifying grace will necessarily and infallibly follow, there is no need that Christ should purchase it; for it is altogether unnecessary that Christ should merit that for us, which we can make sure to our selves, so as to have it necessarily and infallibly. Now that a man can do thus much, to make such grace sure to him, the Dominicans (the best friends that the grace of God can find amongst the Romanists) do affirm; *Dominicus a Soto* (a principal, and the leading man amongst them) asserts it, and that upon the express testimony of *Aquinas* (whose conduct they are wont in their divinity to follow as Angelical) *b out of necessity, not that of constraint, but that of infallibility; Grace is given to him that prepares himself for it, by some help of God.* They hold, that when a man doth his endeavour, God will not deny him grace, (there's their *c* congruous merit) and think they salve all, by saying, this endeavour must be from divine assistance; but *Pelagius* acknowledged, that no less than they and *Augustine*, with other his opposers, take notice of it: yet because he would have grace to be given according to merits (though by merits was understood, not that which deserved it, but any thing done by a sinner, in respect of which grace is given, as *d Bellarmine* confesseth); they condemned him, as evacuating the redemption of Christ, and the grace of God.

b *Quod ex necessitate non quidem coactionis, sed tamen infallibilitatis detur gratia, se, per auxilium Dei præparanti, de nat. & grat. l.* 3. *c.* 13. *p.* 165. And this divine assistance, others of them say, a graceless person may merit, *Profecto longe probabilius dicetur, per opera bona moralia, quibus aliquis ante acceptam gratiam faceret quod moraliter potest, eatenus primam gratiam ex congruo illum mereri, quatenus conveniens, & congruum est, ut cum talis facit, quantum in illo statu moraliter potest; Deus etiam præstat id quod suarum est partium, hoc est ei homini auxilia actualia augeat, quibus adjutus posset facilius gratiam consequi, atque adeo consequatur si sibi non adsit.* Gregor. *de valent. l. de grat. devin. pars* 4. *c. ult.*

c *Peccator per bona opera facta extra charitatem meretur de congruo primam gratiam, ibi est enim quædam congruitas, quia facit quod in se est*, Bonavent. 2. *Dist.* 27. *n.* 39.

d *De gratia & lib. arbitrio, l.* 6. *c.* 5. *p.* 659. *Gratiam autem secundum merita nostra dari intelligunt patres cum aliquid fit proprius viribus, ratione cujus detur gratia, etiamsi non sit illum meritum de condigno.*

In fine, if a man by their principles could not merit justifying grace for himself: yet still, by their Doctrine, there would be no need of Christ's merits: For they teach that any other just man *e* may merit it for him *de congruo*, and do so much on his behalf,

e *Merito congrui potest aliquis alteri mereri primam gratiam*, Aquinas, *prima secundæ q.* 114. *art.* *Bellarmine* will have this past all doubt. *Sicut certum est, non posse unum alteri ex condigno gratiam promereri, ita non dubium est, posse id ex congruo fieri. De Justificat. l.* 5. *c.* 21. *p.* 969. *Bonaventure* will have this to be *meritum dicni*, 1 *Dist.* 41. *n.* 8. *Est dignitas cum indignitate sicut cum vir justus meretur peccatori primam gratiam dignitas enim est ex parte viri justi*, 2 *Dist.* 27. *n.* 39.

as it would be indecent and incongruous to the bounty of God, to deny him grace. And this is enough to make him sure of it infallibly; seeing the Lord is as far from acting undecently or incongruously, as he is from dealing unjustly.

I need not tell you these errors are dangerous; unless you need be told that there is danger in making Christ signifie little or nothing in the justifying of sinners.

The last thing propounded is the application of this Redemption, *i.e.* of the bloud of Christ, or his obedience or his righteousness, (for those are used by the Apostle, as terms of the same import). If we be accepted as righteous, it must be upon the account of some righteousness; we have none of our own that can acquit us before the Lord's tribunal. That of ours will neither satisfie for what is past, nor serve us for the future; it cannot of it self be a good title to life, which has in it just ground for condemnation. The righteousness of Christ is alsufficient for all the exigences of our condition. But that it may be our Justification, (*Rom.* 5. 18.) it must be our Righteousness: and how can that be? We need no other man to tell us, than *Bellarmine* himself; *a The sin of* Adam (says he) *is communicated in such a manner, as that which is past, can be communicated*; that is by imputation. If the Cardinal had not been a meer servant to his *hypothesis*, he would have followed this so far as the reason of it leads him; and then it would have brought him to acknowledg no less of the righteousness of the second *Adam* than of the sin of the first: both are past, and no other way to communicate what is past, but by imputation.

a *Nobis vero communicatur per generationem, eo modo, quo communicari potest id quod transiit, nimirum per imputationem. De amiss. grat. L. 5. c. 17. p. 332.*

This imputation is it which they will deny, and yet cannot but confess. And in their great Champion, we may see manifestly the evidence of truth strugling with the power of interest and prejudice; and prevailing so far as to force from him three or four acknowledgments of this imputation, in that *b* dispute, where he sets himself with all his might to oppose it.

b *De justific. l. 2. c. 17. p. 785. Ss. quarto refellitur, & c. 10. p. 793. Et hoc modo non esset absurdum, si quis nobis diceret, nobis imputari Christi justitiam & merita, cum nobis donentur & applicentur, ac si nos ipsi Deo satisfeciss-mus, & p. 794. Ss. respondeo & Sf. hac igitur falsa, &c.*

There are these severals considerable, about the imputing this righteousness: first Substitution; Christ satisfied in our stead, *i. e.* He tendred that which was due from us. Secondly, Acceptance; the Father accepted what Christ performed in our stead, as performed on our behalf. Thirdly, Participation; we have the fruits and advantages of his undertaking, no less than if we our selves had satisfied. Now, the first of these the Romanists assert, the third they acknowledg, and the second they cannot deny, unless they will deny that the Father accepted Christ's perfect performance, on the behalf of those for whom he undertook it by his own appointment. And as this performance, so stated, is that we mean, by Christ's righteousness: so this acceptance, as declared in the Gospel, in reference to those that believe, includes all that we mean by imputation. Nor need we contend for more, than they cannot, without something like blasphemy, deny, *viz.* God's acceptance of Christ's satisfaction.

Then

Then doth God impute the righteousness of Christ to a believer, when he accepts what Christ performed for him, as if he had performed it. As we say, then a Creditor imputes the payment of the debt to the debtor, when he accepts of what the surety pays for him, as if himself had paid it. There is ground enough in Scripture to use this for illustration at least. *Heb.* 7. 22. *Matth.* 6. 12.

And by the light hereof, *a* a mean capacity may see a clear answer to the greatest objections made by the Papists against Christ's righteousness imputed, 1. *Obj.* If Christ's righteousness be truly imputed unto us, then we might be called, and accounted redeemers of the World. *Ans.* He might as reasonably say, the debtor may be called and accounted the surety, because the surety's payment is accepted for him, 2. *Obj.* If Christ's righteousness be imputed to us as if it were ours, then we ought to be accounted as righteous as Christ. *Answ.* He might as well argue, the debtor is as rich as the surety, because the surety pays his debt, 3. *Obj.* If by the righteousness of Christ imputed to us, we may be said to be truly righteous; then Christ, by our unrighteousness imputed to him, may be truly called a sinner. *Answ.* Which is just as if he should say; If the acceptance of the surety's payment acquit the debtor; then the surety, because the debt is charged on him, (though he contracted it not) is as bad a husband, and as much a bankrupt as the debtor.

a Without lessening the difference betwixt debts and punishments; a surety as to either will serve our purpose. *Answ.*

I need bring no particular arguments for this. All the Scriptures, where there is mention of Christ's dying for us, his sufferings, cleansing us with his bloud, his obedience to death, *&c.* (since it cannot be denied but all this was well pleasing to God, and accepted by him, as it was performed on the behalf of believers) are undeniable proofs, that his righteousness is imputed.

And it is a wonder to me, that any who acknowledg the satisfaction of Christ, should have the confidence to say, there is no evidence for this imputation, in the sense expressed; but their causeless prejudice against the word, makes them it seems so sullen, that they will not take notice of the things we mean, though they meet with it every where in Scripture.

In short, (I fear I have transgressed already, and must omit much of what I intended); if Christ's righteousness be not imputed, it is not accepted; if it be not accepted, it is not performed, and so there will be no satisfaction, no redemption in Jesus Christ. This is *Bellarmine*'s own inference when he is disputing against *Osiander*; to deny God's accepting Christ's righteousness for us, (which is by the premisses his imputing it to us) is to overthrow the whole mystery of mans redemption and reconciliation.

D. Justific. l. 2. c. 2. c. 5. p. 778. from his opinion, says he, *Certe sequitur, ut Christi justitiam Deus non acceptet*, which cannot be admitted, *nisi quis velit totum mysterium humanæ redemptionis & reconciliationis everterc.*

Use. For Application. Let me admonish you, as you tender the honour of Christ, and the comfort and happiness of your souls; to receive and preserve the Doctrine of Justification pure and untainted, as the Apostle delivered it. Beware especially of the Popish corruptions, whereby they

they have adulterated, and wherewith they have overwhelmed it. Whereas it is, as delivered in Scripture, the foundation of our hopes, and the spring of our comforts: they have made it a sink, into which a great part of their other corruptions do run, and settle; or the source from which they rise, and are fed. I might make this good by an account of particulars: but those I have touched already are too many. They tell you, to be justified, is to be sanctified, and so sanctified, as to need no further sanctification after the first infusion: no growth in grace, no increase of holiness, no progress therein, nor mortification neither, no need of, no reason for it. Their principles are so indulgent, as to free you from such trouble. But then you must not take notice of the many commands of God which enjoyn these, and make them necessary; nor of the hazard that attends such neglects. They will assure you there is none under the notion which they represent them.

They tell you, you must be justified by your own righteousness, and that a perfect righteousness within you; that's it you must trust to; and if you think much to be justified, as never any sinner in the world was; and know not how to compass a righteousness absolutely perfect within you: they will inform you, that any degree of charity, the least, the weakest, is righteousness in perfection. Thus you may be justified in their way, if you will but have patience till your inherent righteousness in this world be perfect and spotless; or till the lowest degree of it be absolute perfection. If you think it impossible to be justified upon such terms; they will tell you there is nothing more easy. Any of their Sacraments will help you to it; for they all confer justifying grace, and that by the meer external act. You may have it, though you never mind what you are a doing, when you are at Sacrament, to get it. An easie way to Heaven indeed, if it were as easie to be saved, as deluded.

They will have you believe that their Doctrine of Justification is that which we must approve, since it includes pardon; and yet they have no pardon by their Doctrine, while there is one speck of sin in their souls: and so not in this world, and the other is no world for it. And though they fancy, that fault, and stain, and desert, and the very being of sin, is abolished when they have pardon; and will have none, that is not lawful: yet are they not pardoned for all that, but plainly condemned, and into infernal fires they must go, and be there tortured, (after they are so fully pardoned) till themselves have fully satisfied, and paid the utmost farthing. And if they cannot do that, which Christ only can do, *viz.* satisfie the justice of God for all sorts of sins, as to part of the punishment due to some, and the whole punishment due to others. Their Purgatory will prove Hell, everlastingness not abated: and they will find themselves damned eternally, and cast into Hell, who, by their Doctrine, were betrayed into that state, under a pretence of being

ing punished there a while, in order to Salvation. And if the demerit of sins, which they call venial, prove greater, than they believe (without and against Scripture) they are in Hell, while they dream they are but in Purgatory; for the partition between Hell and Purgatory, is but the distinction made in their fansies, betwixt mortal and venial sins, as to their demerit.

Thus are they in danger to be pardoned, and no wonder, since there is not one sin in five hundred, which, by their Doctrine, needs Christ or his blood for its pardon; there's no need of the blood of sprinkling for the infinite numbers of their venials. They have a sprinkling of their own will serve, an holy water conjured into such divine powers, as to wash away a world of sins, fault and punishment both. This is the fountain (one of them) which themselves have opened for sin and uncleanness; and the other opened by Christ may be shut up, unless there may be some use of it for another sort of sins, but those very few, in comparison.

Remissio Venialium qui est effectus aquæ benedictæ sine collatione gratiæ & sanctitatis confertur. Non pœnas culparum modo, sed id quod mihi probabilius est, culpas quoq; veniales remittet. Melchior Canus. *De Sacr. pars* 1. *p.* 751.

Indeed, it is the intollerable injury they offer to Christ, his redemption, and the free grace of God, which makes their Doctrine of Justification most intollerable. To strip the redemption which is in Jesus Christ, of its merit or satisfaction, without which it is no redemption: to make the mercy of God needless, or the free exercise of it impossible, and his grace to be no grace; is the way not to be justified, but condemned. This is to seek pardon of former offences, by new crimes, as if one would not receive a pardon without interlining it with something of treasonable import against him who offers it. Yea, it seems an attempt to blot out of the pardon all that is pardoning; and to affront and deface that upon which all the hopes of a condemned sinner depends, and without which no flesh can be justified. When ever the Lord justifies any, he doth it *freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ:* they that will not be thus justified, are in danger o be condemned.

SERMON XIII.

God not to be Worshipped as represented by an Image.

Mr Benjamin Keach

'Tis not lawful to give Religious Worship to any Creature whatsoever.

'Tis not lawful to make an Image of God.

'Tis not lawful to Worship God, as represented by an Image, or to direct our Worship of him to an Image.

'Tis not lawful to Worship Images, by doing it corporally, as Idolaters do, though we pretend to keep our hearts to God.

The Papists presumptuously leave the second Commandment out of the Decalogue.

Mat. 4. 10. *Then saith Jesus unto him, Get thee hence, Satan, for it is written, Thou shalt Worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.*

THE eleven first Verses of this Chapter, contain the History of the Combat, or Conflict between Christ and Satan; and in *it* you may take notice of these Particulars.

1. You have the preparation to the *Combat*, v. 1,2. *Then was Jesus led up of the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the Devil; and when he had fasted forty days and forty nights, he was afterwards an hungred.* *Then*, that is, immediately after Christ had been baptized in an extraordinary manner, and solemnly declared by a voice from Heaven, that he was *the beloved Son of God, in whom he was well pleased*; and after *the Heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a Dove, and lighting upon him*, and was *full of the Holy Ghost*, as St. *Luke* records it, *Luke* 4. 1. *Then* (that that is imme-

immediately after this) *he was led up of the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the Devil.* We should have thought that the next news might have been of his taking a solemn Journey to *Jerusalem*, and in the Temple there publickly to have declared, that he was the great Doctor and Prophet of his *Church*, and that they were accordingly to hear him: but God's thoughts are not as our thoughts; the Text tells you, *then*, that is, immediately upon this, *he was led by the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the Devil.*

2. You have the Combat or Conflict it self, from the third Verse to the eleventh: the Devil takes an occasion hereupon to set upon him, and to assault him with these dreadful temptations. The first temptation, or assault, you have Vers. 3. *If thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread:* As if he had said, There was a Voice presently from Heaven, that thou art Gods beloved Son, in whom he is well pleased; but if so, is it likely that God should take no further care of his own Son whom he loved, than to expose him to the want even of necessaries for the present life? so that, either thou art not the Son of God; and that pretended Voice from Heaven is but a delusion, or if thou beest so, let it appear by making of this Miracle, *Command that these stones be made bread.* The reply or answer made by our Saviour to this temptation, you have Vers. 4. *But he answered and said, It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God:* where our Saviour shews, that this was a notorious Imposture, and a fallacious way of reasoning, that either he must perish in the wilderness with famine, or else he must prove himself to be the Son of God by working a Miracle, and commanding stones to be made bread: for, *It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.* This temptation not taking effect, and the Devil foiled and non-plust by the force and dint of the Scripture, he makes a second assault upon him, Vers. 5, 6. *Then the Devil taketh him up into the holy City, and setteth him on a Pinacle of the Temple, and saith unto him, If thou be the Son of God, cast thy self down, for it is written, He shall give his Angels charge concerning thee, and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone.* I know that St. *Luke* observes not the same order in the recording of these temptations, as St. *Matthew* doth, but it is likely that was the third and last temptation, when Satan had that rebuke given him by our Saviour, *Get thee hence, Satan*, for immediately upon this, Vers. 11. *the Devil leaveth him, and Angels came and ministred unto him*; and therefore I call this the second assault or temptation. The third and the last temptation, or assault, which seems to be most dangerous, you have Vers. 8, 9. *Again, the Devil taketh him up into an exceeding high Mountain, and sheweth him all the Kingdoms of the World, and the Glory of them, and saith unto him, All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me.* In St. *Luke*,

Chap. 4. 6. he pretends a reason for it, *And the Devil said unto him, All this power will I give thee, and the Glory of them, for that is delivered unto me, and to whomsoever I will I give it.* And Vers. 7. *If thou therefore wilt worship me, all shall be thine.* But the Devil was a Lyar from the beginning, and there were three notorious Lyes in this pretence of the Devils: 1. *All this power will I give thee, and the Glory of them*; whereas he had no such Power or Glory to bestow. 2. The second was, *For that is delivered unto me:* but God never made the Devil the Heir of all things, but his own Son. *Heb.* 1. 2. *He hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed Heir of all things.* 3. The third was, *To whomsoever I will, I give it:* as if Satan could give the Kingdoms of the World to whom he pleased, a power which God hath reserved for himself, and hath not conferred on any Creature whatsoever. *Daniel* 2. 20, 21. *Blessed be the Name of God for ever and ever, for Wisdom and Might are his, he changeth the times and the seasons, he removeth Kings, and setteth up Kings.* We read that Satan is sometimes transformed into an Angel of Light, 2 *Cor.* 6. 14. but here he would be transformed into God himself; as also in that which follows, namely, that he would be adored and worshipped; *If thou therefore wilt worship me, all shall be thine:* or, as you have it in the Text, *All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me.* Now in these words you have the reply or answer that our Saviour makes to this temptation; *Then saith Jesus unto him, Get thee hence, Satan, for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve:* where you have two things considerable: 1. You have something premised, or something prefatory unto Christ's answer, *Get thee hence, Satan*; which may be understood two ways: 1. Either as *Vox detestantis*, a Note of abhorrence and detestation, of the Devils horrible impudence and blasphemy, in that he would have Christ to fall down and worship him: or, 2. As *Vox imperantis*, a word of power and authority, commanding him out of his presence, *Get thee hence, Satan*; and thereby sufficiently declaring himself to be the Son of God, which was the thing in question: the Devil had twice put an *if* upon his Sonship, Vers. 3. *If thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread:* And Vers. 6. *If thou be the Son of God, cast thy self down:* Now our Saviour will have this to be out of question, and therefore commands him to be gone, *Get thee hence, Satan*; and the next news is, Vers. 11. *Then the Devil leaveth him, and behold, Angels came and ministred unto him.* 2. You have the answer it self, *For it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.* Where again you have two things to be taken into Consideration: 1. You have our Saviours urging Scripture in the case, *It is written:* The Word of God is armour of proof against Satan and his temptations, and hence the Apostle makes it one main part of the Christian armour, *Ephes.* 6. 17. *Take the Helmet of Salvation, and the Sword of the Spirit, which is the*

Word

Word of God; and our Saviour makes use of this Sword in the Text, *It is written*, but where, see *Deut.6.13. Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and serve him*; and Deut.10.20. *Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, him shalt thou serve, and to him shalt thou cleave:* where I would note, that our Saviour doth not quote the very words that are in *Deuteronomy*, it is said there, *Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and serve him*, our Saviour says, *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve:* and yet notwithstanding, *It is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.* And I would the rather take notice of this, because there are a generation of men amongst us, that tell us, upon occasion, that we do not speak Scripture-Language, and their reason is, because we do not speak Scripture-words: But, Friends, take this for a principle, If we speak Scripture-sence, though not the very words of Scripture, yet we may be said to speak Scripture-Language: Thus our Saviour here speaking Scripture-sence, speaks Scripture-Language, *It is written.* Fear is a word of great latitude and extent, and comprehends in its self that homage, and honour, and reverence, that we owe to God; and therefore our Saviour calls it Worship, and says, *It is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, &c.* Thus it is also in the like case, if the word person be Scripture-sence, it is Scripture-Language: if the word Sacrament be Scripture-sence, it is Scripture-Language. 2. You have the Scripture that is urged in these words, *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.* Satan would have our Saviour to *fall down and worship him:* our Saviour replies, *It is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve:* and the meaning and import of it is this, that which is proper and peculiar unto God, ought not to be given unto any Creature whatsoever: but Worship is so, and therefore ought not to be given to any Creature whatsoever. Satan is a Creature, and if there were no more in the case than that, even that is reason sufficient why he ought not to be Worshipped: *Then saith Jesus unto him, Get thee hence, Satan, for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.* Thus I have given you an account both of the preparation to the Combat or Conflict between Christ and Satan, as also of the Combat or Conflict it self; thirdly, you have the issue of the whole transaction between Christ and Satan, Vers. 11. *Then the Devil leaveth him, and behold Angels came and ministred unto him.*

My Text contains the answer, or the repulse that was given by our Saviour unto Satans third and last assault; *Then saith Jesus unto him, Get thee hence, Satan, for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.*

The Proposition that I would commend unto your Consideration from the words, is this, That *Religious Worship ought not to be given to any Creature whatsoever:* or thus; *God alone is, and ought to be the Object of Religious Worship.* I say, God alone is, and ought to be the Object of Religious Worship: Honour and Worship is Gods due and right; *Prop.*

and

and irreligion is a piece of wrong and injuſtice; and indeed, if divine honour was not given to God as his due and right, worſhip will be a part of benevolence from the creature unto God.

1. In the proſecution of this point, I ſhall, by God's aſſiſtance, obſerve this method. 1. I ſhall give you a brief deſcription of worſhip, and ſhew you what worſhip is.

2. I ſhall lay down ſome diſtinctions for the due ſtating, and the right underſtanding of this propoſition.

3. I ſhall endeavour to prove the propoſition, namely, that *religious worſhip ought not to be given to any creatures whatſoever*; or that *God alone is, and ought to be the object of religious worſhip.*

4. And the fourth particular ſhall be the Uſe and Application.

1. For the firſt of theſe, I ſhall endeavour to diſpatch in a few words; namely, to give you a brief deſcription of worſhip, and ſhew you what worſhip is.

Worſhip is that honour or reverence that we give unto a perſon, or being, regard being had to the dignity and excellency of that perſon or being that is to be worſhipped; and it conſiſts of three Acts.

1. An act of the mind, whereby we rightly conceive of the dignity and excellency of that perſon or being that we worſhip.

2. An act of the will, whereby, upon occaſion, we are ready and willing to pay all offices of reſpect to that perſon or being.

3. An act of the body, whereby we expreſs that reſpect or honour that is in our minds, unto that perſon or being, by ſome outward one of bodily act, as proſtration, uncovering of the head, bowing the knee, or the like; and this is all I ſhall ſay to the firſt particular, what worſhip is.

2. Our next work is, to lay down ſome diſtinctions for the due ſtating and right underſtanding of this propoſition; namely, *that religious worſhip ought not to be given to any creature whatſoever*; or that *God alone is and ought to be the object of religious worſhip*: as,

1. We muſt diſtinguiſh between our works, and religious worſhip: now, although religious worſhip ought to be given to God alone, yet civil worſhip may, and ought to be given unto creatures: this is a duty from Inferiors to their Superiors, from Children to their Parents, from Servants to their Maſters, from ſubjects to Kings and Magiſtrates; theſe Gods muſt have civil worſhip: thus it is ſaid of *Judah*, when *Jacob* on his death-bed bleſſed the twelve tribes, *Gen.* 49. 8. Judah, *thou art he whom thy brethren ſhall praiſe; thy hand ſhall be in the neck of thine enemies; thy Father's children ſhall bow down before thee: Judah*'s honour was to weild the Scepter; and therefore the reſt of the Tribes his Father's children, in a civil ſenſe, were to worſhip him, and bow down before him: thus, when *Joſeph* came into the preſence of *Jacob* his Father, it is ſaid, 48. 12. That *he bowed himſelf with his face to the earth*; this was civil worſhip.

And

And indeed, this worship considered apart, and in a separate way, seems to be proper unto the creature, and so not fit to be given unto God. If any should say, but is not God to receive all honour, and glory, and worship; and if so, why should civil worship be excluded? I answer, because this is not the way to honour God: if we should worship God no otherwise than as we worship a creature, this would be to blaspheme him, under a pretence of giving him that honour that we owe him. We may observe even amongst the creatures, that the homage or honour that we give unto the creature, hath alwaies respect unto the greatest excellency of that creature; as suppose a *King* were present, a *Duke*, or a *Marquess*, or an *Earl*; if a man should give him only that respect that is due unto a *Duke*, or a *Marquess*, or an *Earl*, this were in effect to degrade him of his *Kingly* power: if we give only the honour unto God, that a Creature may challenge as his due, this strikes at the very God-head it self, and we do, what lies in us, to degrade him of his supremacy and transparent glory.

2. We must distinguish between inward worship, and outward worship: there is inward worship in Faith, and Love, and Hope, and Fear, and other elicit acts of the mind; this is the inward homage that we owe unto God: and then there is outward worship, which consists in the outward expression of that inward homage and subjection that we owe to God, which is done as you heard before, by some outward one of bodily act, as prostrating, uncovering of the head, bowing of the knee, and the like. Now, though the worship of God consists mainly and principally in the former; for there may be a pretence of outward homage and reverence, and yet nothing of worship; as the Souldiers bowed the knee to Christ, and yet mocked him, *Matth.* 27. 29. yet outward worship is necessary; inward and outward worship doth mutually depend upon each other: he that doth not pray, nor read, nor hear, nor receive Sacraments, doth neither love God, nor fear him, nor trust in him. And besides, outward worship is a most effectual help and assistance unto the principle of inward worship, strengthening the habit of it, and exciting of it unto all sutable actions: for though *bodily exercise*, as it is single, and divided from the heart, doth, as the Apostle saith, *profit little*: yet when it joyns with it, it profits much, and makes us far more lively in the service of God, than otherwise we should be: and we may find by experience, that when we pray only inwardly in our spirits, we have not that life and enlargement in our minds and affections, as when we also pray outwardly with the voice; and upon these and such like grounds, it is advised by some, that prayer, though secret, should be vocal, because it excites affection, and quickens devotion: thus, though inward worship be the main of worship, and that which may most properly be called worship; yet outward worship is necessary: the second Commandment hath a special respect unto outward worship, namely, that we perform unto God that outward worship which he hath appointed

appointed in his Word. And that which the Devil would have of our Saviour here, is outward Worſhip, *All theſe things will I give thee if thou wilt fall down and worſhip me.* If any ſhall pretend that it is External Veneration that they give unto other things beſides God, whereas that which is inward, and which may moſt properly be called Worſhip, they reſerve for God: the vanity of ſuch a pretence will appear, if we conſider, that it is not a neceſſary requiſite unto falſe and idolatrous Worſhip, that the inward devotion of the mind ſhould accompany the external adoration of the body: for if ſo, it will follow, that a man being commanded under a ſevere penalty, might give outward adoration to any Image, either of the true or falſe gods, and yet be guiltleſs; and who durſt ever ſay ſo?

3. We will take it for granted, that Religious Worſhip admits of degrees, namely, that there is Religious Worſhip in an higher degree, and Religious Worſhip in a lower and inferiour degree: for, I ſuppoſe, that the Veneration and Adoration that our Adverſaries of the Church of *Rome* give unto Images and Reliques, and things of that nature, is not Civil, but Religious, though in a lower and an inferiour degree. Now this being taken for granted, I affirm, That God, and God alone, is and ought to be the Object of Religious Worſhip, in the latitude of it; and that Religious Worſhip in the loweſt and moſt inferiour degree, ought not to be given unto any Creature whatſoever, and that will appear from theſe following Conſiderations.

1. It appears from the words of the Text, *Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve.* Now if we are to Worſhip God alone, and ſerve God alone, then *God, and God alone is and ought to be the Object of Religious Worſhip; and Religious Worſhip ought not to be given unto any Creature whatſoever.* If it be Objected, That the Text doth not ſay, Thou ſhalt *worſhip* the Lord thy God only, but him only ſhalt thou *ſerve:* that there is indeed an honour and a ſervice that is due unto God alone, which to give unto any Creature would be Idolatry. Him only ſhalt thou *ſerve*: but there is a *Worſhip* which is due unto the Creatures according to their reſpective Excellencies, as to Saints, holy things, and holy places, and we may worſhip them, though we may not ſerve them: but if this were the ſenſe of this Scripture, the Devil might have excepted againſt the anſwer made by our Saviour as inſufficient: he might have ſaid, Thou mayſt *worſhip* me, though thou mayſt not *ſerve* me: and that this Scripture did not forbid all Worſhip, yea that ſome Religious Worſhip might be given to a Creature in a lower and inferiour degree, though the Supreme Worſhip might not; and all that he deſired of our Saviour was, *That he would fall down and worſhip him:* that it was inferiour *Worſhip*, though *Religious*, which the Devil required of Chriſt, is plain, for he acknowledges God at the ſame time to be his Superiour, and the Giver of that power which he laid claim to, *Luk.* 4. 6. *And the Devil ſaid unto him, All this power will*

will I give thee, and the glory of them, for that is delivered unto me, and unto whomsoever I will I give it: And yet that is the *Worship* which Christ saith God hath forbidden to be given unto any Creature; and our Saviour discovers his abhorrence and detestation of any thing of that nature, *Get thee hence, Satan, for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.* Nor was it the scope of our Saviour to give countenance to any such distinction as this, as appears from that place of Scripture which is here quoted, *Deut. 6. 13. Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and serve him, and shalt swear by his Name.* Vers. 14. *Ye shall not go after other gods, of the gods of the people which are round about you.* Where *Moses* doth not distinguish between the *Worship* that is due to *God*, and that *Worship* which may be given unto the Creature; but describes the *Worship* which ought to be given unto *God*, and to *God* alone, and which ought not to be given unto the gods of the Gentiles: and besides this ought to be taken into Consideration, we do not find the word *only* in *Deuteronomy* annexed either to the *fear* of God, or to the *service* of God. Now would it have been fairly and ingeniously done by any that lived under the Old Testament Dispensation, to make this gloss upon the Text? It is true, we must fear the Lord our God, but not him only; and serve him, but not serve him only: so that our Saviour add the word *only* for Explication sake; and indeed if God be to be worshipped at all, and served at all, for the same reason he *only* is to be worshipped, and he *only* is to be served: so that our Saviour doth not only recite this Text in *Deuteronomy*, but he doth it with advantage, when he tells Satan, *It is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve. Worship* is called *Religious*, because it binds us to God, and to God alone: and wherever in Scripture it is said we must worship God, we must always understand it thus, we must worship him alone. Thus the Angel in the *Revelations*, Chap. 19. 10. where he tells *John*, that he must *Worship God*; the meaning is, that he must *Worship God alone.* Psal. 29. 2. *Give unto the Lord the glory due to his Name*; and then it follows by way of explication, *Worship the Lord in the beauty of Holiness.* 'Tis said of *Job*, Chap. 1. Vers. 20. *That he arose, and rent his Mantle, and fell down upon the ground and worshipped:* Nothing is said of the *Object* unto whom he did direct his *Worship*; the *Object* of his *Worship* is not expressed, but understood, and presupposed; if he fell down and *Worshipped* in a religious manner, it is to be taken for granted that he *Worshipped God.*

2. It appears yet further, that *God, and God alone is and ought to be the Object of Religious Worship*, and that *Religious Worship ought not to be given unto any Creature whatsoever*, because God hath expressly forbidden us in Scripture the Worshipping of Angels, *Col.* 2. 18. *Let no man beguile you of your reward, in a voluntary humility, and Worshipping of Angels.* The Apostles scope in this Chapter is to dispute against

those Corruptions that were creeping into the Christian Worship, these sometimes he calls the *traditions of men, the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ*, Vers. 8. and the *commandments and doctrines of men*, *Vers.* 22. And amongst other Corruptions, he cautions them against Worshipping of Angels. Now if Religious Worship might be given to a Creature, then to these glorious Creatures; but this, according to the Apostles sense, is superstition, and will-worship. So Vers. 23. *Which things have indeed a shew of wisdom in will-worship*, how the Church of *Rome* owns and avouches the *Worshipping of Angels*, which the Apostle forbids. 'Tis true indeed, the Papists, in their Worshipping of Saints and Angels, give the Saints the pre-eminence: 'Tis by their means, say they, that Indulgences are given out of the Churches Treasury, or rather put to sale; they having not only merited their own Salvation, but some of them at least supererogated for the good of others, in that they have done more and greater things than are enjoined in Gods Word: And this is an honour, that, according to their Principles, is not, nor ought to be given to the blessed Angels.

But how extravagant soever the fancies of these men are, or may be, yet I shall aver, That if *Religious Worship* might be given to any Creature, then unto these Glorious Creatures, and that not only because they never sinned against God, as the Saints have done, but also because unto their care and tutelage are committed God's holy ones, and they are *sent forth to minister for them that are heirs of salvation*, Heb. 1. 14. But we read not of any such employ assigned by God unto the Saints departed.

If any should say the *Worship* of *Angels* forbidden in the Scripture, is the *Supreme Worship* that is proper unto *God* alone, and to give this indeed unto the *Angels*, would be Superstition and Will-worship, but not *Religious Worship* in an inferiour degree: What an horrible bold perverting of Scripture is this? and who can reasonably imagine, that the Apostle *Paul*, when he knew that the Worshipping of Angels was not only good and lawful, but highly commendable, should yet in the general condemn the *Worshipping of Angels* without any distinction at all made in the case.

And whereas it may be said, that St. *Paul* doth not in the general condemn the *Worshipping of Angels*, but the Worshipping of Angels as *Mediators*, so as to exclude *Christ*: for the Apostle adds, Vers. 19. *And not holding the Head.* It is true, the Apostle doth so: but then we must know, that *Religious Worship*, though in an inferiour degree given to an *Angel*, is inconsistent *with holding the Head, Christ.* As a Wife that gives the honour of her Husbands Bed unto another, (and all religious and divine respect is no less) denies him to be what she calls him, though she call him Husband never so much. The reason urged in the second Commandment against false Worship, is, that *God is a jealous God*; now we must understand it thus; he is *jealous*, not only

less

lest he should not be honoured as God, but he is also *jealous* lest he should not be honoured as one God: for as by the *Worshipping* of him we acknowledge him to be God, so by the *incommunicableness* of that *Worship* to any Creature, we acknowledge him to be one *God.*

And yet that there may be no mistake in this matter, we deny not, but that good men, when Angels have appeared unto them in a visible shape, even when they have known that they have been *Angels*, have given honour to them, and it may be bowed down before them: but then it is granted on all hands, that the same external gesture may be adapted and fitted to the *Worship* that is *Civil*, and that which is *Religious:* and it lies upon our Adversaries to prove, that the honour or *Worship* given unto them was *Religious*, and of the very same kind that we give unto God, but in an inferiour and lower degree. We read of *Abraham*, Gen. 18. 2. *that he lift up his eyes, and lo, three men stood by him; and when he saw them, he ran to meet them from the Tent-door, and bowed himself toward the ground:* but that this was a Civil, not a Religious respect, appears by the entertainment that he offers to make for them, Vers. 4. 5. *Let a little water I pray you be fetched, and wash your feet, and rest your selves under the tree, and I will fetch a morsel of bread, and comfort ye your hearts:* Indeed afterwards he knew one of them to be the Angel of the Covenant, the Lord Jesus Christ, who is called *Jehovah* in that Chapter, and might *Worship* him with *Religious Worship.* But this doth not in the least contradict our Principles, nor the Text, for God must and ought to be *Worshipped*, though we must *Worship the Lord our God, and him only must we serve:* Unto which I might add, that the Servants of God under the Law, had a fair occasion offered them to invoke and *Worship Angels*, which we have not under the Gospel, because they frequently then appeared unto them in the likeness of men, which they do not to us; and yet we never read that the people of God under the Legal Dispensation, did invoke them, or pay any religious respect to them. *David saw the Angel that smote the people*, 2 *Sam.* 24. 17. yet did he not in the least apply himself to the *Angel*, or *Worship* him, but made his address unto God; *David spake unto the Lord, when he saw the Angel that smote the people, and said, Lo I have sinned, but these sheep, what have they done?*

3. It appears yet further, that *God alone is, and ought to be the Object of Religious Worship*, and *that Religious Worship ought not to be given to any Creature whatsoever*, because Religious Worship, though in the *lowest and most inferiour degree*, is such that neither *Saints* nor *Angels* durst own or receive: We read how that the Devil would be Worshipped, but Saints and good Angels would not; and I shall give you two instances for this, the first of a *Saint*, and the second of an *Angel.*

1. The first instance I shall give you is of a Saint, namely, that of *Peter*, Act. 10. 25. *As Peter was coming in, Cornelius met him, and fell down at his feet, and worshipped him:* but Vers. 26. *Peter took him up,*

saying, Stand up, I my self also am a man. The Argument is this: No *man* is to be *worshipped*; But I am a *man*; Therefore I am not to be *worshipped.* Nor is it reasonable to believe, that *Cornelius* would give Religious Worship in the highest degree, which our Adversaries say is proper unto God alone, unto St. *Peter*; for it is said, *Act.* 10. 2. That *Cornelius was a devout man, and one that feared God with all his house, and one that prayed unto God alway.* Nor can it justly be imagined, that a devout man, and one that feared God, and one that prayed unto God alway, should give Religious Worship in the highest degree, which they call *Latriam*, unto St. *Peter*, when he knew he was God's Minister, and not God.

2. The second Instance that I shall give you, is of an *Angel*, Rev. 19. 10. *I fell at his feet to worship him; and he said unto me, See thou do it not, I am thy fellow-servant, see thou do it not*: hereby is signified unto us the heinousness of this sin; as if he had said, beware what thou dost; God forbid that a creature should joyn in co-partnership with God in his worship; *worship God, see thou do it not*; a speech something like that, *Jer.* 44. 4. *Oh do not this abominable thing that I hate*, ver. 3. *They went to burn incense, and to serve other gods, whom they knew not*; and God cried out, as it were with a shriek, *Oh do not this abominable thing that I hate*: thus in the like case, when *John* fell down at the feet of the Angel to worship him, the Angel refuses it with abhorrence and detestation, *See thou do it not*; and he gives this reason for it, *I am thy fellow-servant*: and the argument is this; No servant of Christ ought to be worshipped, but an Angel is a servant of Christ, therefore an Angel is not to be worshipped: *Worship God*, as if he had said, God, and God alone is the object of religious worship, and I am thy fellow-servant; *worship God*: the Angel in this seems to point at that worship which is called *dulia*; why should *dulia* be given to him, that is σεβος? It is an horrible wickedness to serve, and worship thy fellow servant in a religious manner: I am thy fellow-servant, *worship God:* see again to this purpose, *Rev.* 22. 8, 9. *I* John *saw these things, and heard them; and when I had heard, and seen, I fell down to worship before the feet of the Angel, which shewed me these things:* ver. 9. *Then saith he unto me, See thou do it not, for I am thy fellow-servant*, &c. *worship God.* And whereas some pretend that St. *John* took the Angel to be God, and would have worshipped him with *latria*, which is proper to God alone; and therefore the Angel says, *See thou do it not*: this is a meer groundless fancy of their own, and not to be made out by the least *iota* or tittle in the Text; and besides, it is very much that Saint *John* should be mistaken twice in the case, for he was twice repulsed by the Angel, and St. *John* calls him expressly an Angel; *ver.* 8. *I fell down to worship before the feet of the Angel*, and the Angel bids him *worship God*: by which is intimated, that St. *John*'s mistake was not in the person, but in the worshipping of the person; for that religious worship, though in the lowest, and most inferior

ferior degree, is such, that neither Saint nor Angel durst own or receive.

4. It appears yet further, that God, and God alone is and ought to be the object of religious worship, and that religious worship ought not to be given to any creature whatsoever, from the consideration of the nature of worship it self, together with that God that is to be worshipped: religious worship *in Solidum*, as well in one degree as another, is due to God, and proper only unto him: as there is no proportion between God and a creature, because there is an infinite distance between the one and the other; so it follows, that if it were possible, there should be an infinite disproportion between the honour that we give to God, and the honour that we give unto a Creature. And since the Divine Excellency doth differ in kind from that which is, or can possibly be in any Creature, it necessarily follows, that the Worship and Honour that is given unto God, ought to differ in kind from that Worship and Honour that we give unto the Creature: so that to give the same Worship unto God and to the Creature, differing only in degree, is in effect to say, that the Creature is but in a degree inferiour unto God. Unto which I might add,

5. In the fifth place, That if Idolatry consists only in giving Religious Worship in the highest degree unto a Creature, then the *Arrians* are falsly charged with Idolatry by ancient and modern Divines, for giving Religious Worship unto Christ, who, they say, is but a Creature, though the best of Creatures: I suppose that even our Adversaries themselves make no scruple to charge *Arrians* with Idolatry: Now it is not easily to be imagined, how the *Arrians* should give *Latriam*, or Religious Worship in the highest degree unto Christ, whom they profess to be a Creature, and not God; and if Religious Worship in an inferiour degree may be given unto a Creature, why then are they charged with Idolatry?

Unto which I might also add, That this will justifie at least many of the best and wisest of the Heathens in their Superstitious and Idolatrous practices, many of the Heathens Worshipping the true God by false *mediums*: for instance, the men of *Athens*, *Act.* 17. 23. *As I passed by, and beheld your devotions, I found an Altar with this Inscription, TO THE UNKNOWN GOD: whom therefore you ignorantly worship, him declare I to you*; and yet the Apostle charges them with Superstition, Vers. 22. *I perceive that in all things you are too superstitious*: the Altar was dedicated unto the same God that *Paul* preached, and yet even in this they were too superstitious.

Thus I have endeavoured to clear this great truth unto you, That God, and God alone is and ought to be the Object of Religious Worship; and, That Religious Worship ought not to be given unto any Creature whatsoever. If it be said, That Religious Worship upon occasion hath been given unto a Creature, as for instance, upon Gods appearing,

pearing unto *Moses* in the Burning Bush, *Exod.* 3. 5. God said unto *Moses*, *Draw not nigh hither, put off thy shooes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground.* And thus the Israelites were to Worship before the Ark, even by the appointment of God himself, *Psal.* 99. 5. *Exalt ye the Lord our God, and worship at his footstool; for he is holy.* Now if so, how is this a truth, That God, and God alone is the Object of Religious Worship; and, That Religious Worship ought not to be given unto any Creature whatsoever? For the removing of this difficulty, I shall say two things.

1. That in whatever place God is pleased to manifest his special and extraordinary presence, that place, during that time, may be said to be holy, or to be sanctified; and thus it was in the case of the holy ground, *Exod.* 3. 2. *The Angel of the Lord appeared to him in a flame of fire, out of the midst of a Bush.* Now that this Angel of the Lord was God himself, appears Vers. 4. *When the Lord saw that he turned aside to see, God called unto him out of the midst of a Bush:* upon this the Lord said, *Draw not nigh hither, put off thy shooes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground.* And so also as for the Ark, God had promised his special presence there, and to *commune with his people from above the Mercy-seat, from between the two Cherubims which were upon the Ark of the Testimony*, Exod. 25. 22. And hence God is said to dwell between the Cherubims, *Psal.* 80. 1. *Give ear, O Shepherd of Israel, thou that leadest Joseph like a flock, thou that dwellest between the Cherubims, shine forth.* And hence the Shewbread that was placed upon a Table before the Ark, is said to be set before God, *Exod.* 25. 39. *Thou shalt set upon the Table Shewbread before me alway*; and this Bread was therefore called *panis facierum*, the Bread of faces, and *panis propositionis*, because it was placed before the Ark. But I shall add, that there is no place under the Gospel that can be said to be holy upon the account of God's special and extraordinary presence: if there be any such, let our Adversaries shew us where it is, and give us sufficient proof of it, and we will frankly comply with them, and grant that place to be holy and sanctified.

2. The second thing that I say is this, That although *Moses* was to put off his shooes because the place whereon he stood was holy ground, yea, and that respect was given to the ground because of God's special and extraordinary presence in that place, which was signified by putting off the shooes. (Take this for granted); yet how doth it appear that the respect given to the ground was Religious, or that Religious Worship was given to the ground? Oh, say our Adversaries, because it was holy. Grant it, the ground was holy, but must it therefore be worshipped religiously? If you form this into an Argument, it runs thus: Whatever is holy, ought to be worshipped religiously: But the Lord tells you the ground was holy; Therefore it ought to be worshipped religiously. But who sees not the weakness of the first Proposition, namely,

namely, That whatever is holy ought to be worshipped religiously? *Aaron* was holy, and the Priests under the Law were holy, but yet we read not that they were worshipped religiously, or with Religious Worship, either living or dead, much less did they worship their Garments, though they also were holy. We have, or at least we ought to have a respect for the people of God, as such, as they are religious and holy persons; and yet it doth not follow from hence, that therefore they are religiously to be worshipped: Yea, the people of God are holy, if compared with the holy ground it self, in an eminent and transcendent manner: *for after God*, i. e. after the image of God, *they are created in righteousness and true holiness:* the ground was only capable of relative holiness, but the people of God are enriched and beautified with inherent holiness; and are sanctified, not only in a way of external Relation as the ground was, but inwardly, and inherently in their lives they are sanctified throughout, both in body, soul and spirit; and yet they are not to be worshipped with Religious Worship.

As for that instance concerning the Ark, that also is called holy, *Psal.* 99. 5. *Exalt ye the Lord our God, and worship at his footstool, for he is holy*, so our Translation renders it; or as it is in the Margent of the Bible, *for it is holy:* which way soever you render the words, it is much at one to our purpose, for although the Jews worshipped God at his Footstool, or before the Ark, which was his Footstool, yet it doth not appear that they worshipped his Footstool, no not with Religious Worship in a lesser or inferiour degree. The Israelites might worship God before the Ark, and yet not worship the Ark: thus the Wise-men worshipped Christ wrapped in Swadling-cloaths, laid in a Manger; but yet they did not worship either the Cloaths or the Manger: thus those that sung *Hosanna to the Son of David, Hosanna in the highest*, worshipped Christ riding upon an Ass, but they did not worship the Ass it self: whatever respect therefore was given to the ground, or to the Ark, it doth not appear that it was religious: if any be offended with the word Civil, and take it to be too low a word in a case of this nature, by my consent we will not be angry about words, let them call it, if they please, *Supercivilis*; or if they will but acknowledge that it was not the same Worship for kind that we give unto God, the strife, as far as this goes, shall be at an end, and we shall be beholding to them for a better word, when they shall be at leisure to furnish us therewith.

We may take notice from hence of the Superstition and Idolatry of the Church of *Rome*, in giving that Worship that is proper unto God, and unto him alone, unto other things; and here I shall not speak to the Idolatry of the Church of *Rome* in the latitude of it, but take occasion to make mention of their worshipping of Saints, and their worshipping of Images. *Use* 1.

1. Their worshipping of Saints. Our Adversaries tell us, that we do them wrong when we say that they give that Worship unto the Creature,

that

that is proper unto God, and do frankly acknowledge that if they did so, they should make a Creature a God, and by consequence be guilty of Idolatry. But how they will or can acquit themselves in this particular, for my part I cannot understand: for actions, or gestures, or words, directed to any Creature, that doth imply that Creature to have any of God's incommunicable Attributes, and Divine Perfections, do questionless give that honour to the Creature which is proper unto God; and this is done by those of the Church of *Rome*: for instance, when thousands of Papists in thousands of places at one and the same time pray unto Saints, and in particular to the Virgin *Mary*, doth not this suppose the Saints, and in particular the Virgin *Mary*, to be Omniscient, and Omnipresent? And are not these some of God's incommunicable Attributes, and Divine Perfections? And is not the Omniscience and Omnipresence of God one main ground of Religious Worship? And is not God to be invoked every where, because he sees and hears whatsoever is done upon the Earth, and is present in all places? *I will*, saith the Apostle, 1 *Tim.* 2. 8. *that men pray every where, lifting up holy hands without wrath and doubting.* We have no reason to lift up holy hands to a Saint, unless that Saint was every where: And whereas some pretend that the Saints may see all things in God *in speculo deitatis*, in the Glass of the Deity; this Glass hath long since been broken by the hand of the Learned, nor is there any thing else like to be seen by it, but the rashness of some bold persons, who dare to sport with Divine things, and aspire unto a wisdom above that which is written, the Scripture not in the least making mention of any such thing: yea, the Humanity of Christ himself, though personally united unto the Divine Nature, did not pretend to it; for our Saviour speaking of the Day of Judgment, doth freely and openly declare to all the world, *Mark* 13. 32. *Of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no not the Angels which are in Heaven, neither the Son, but the Father:* Nor can the meaning be that the Son knew not of the Day of Judgment in this sense, namely, so as to make it known unto the world, for in that sense the Father himself may be said to know nothing of that day and hour, when he is plainly excepted in the case, *Of that day and hour knoweth no man, no not the Angels which are in Heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.* And seeing *operari sequitur esse*, and every being doth exercise its operations in such a way as is suitable to its nature and essence, it is an hard matter to conceive that a finite Creature can be capable of infinite knowledge, and exercise it accordingly: but I shall not insist upon this, because it is to be managed by another hand: however, I shall take my liberty to add hereunto two Considerations, and so pass on.

1. We Protestants acknowledge that we have an honour for the blessed Apostles, and Martyrs, and Saints, and upon occasion give them their due praises, and celebrate their memorials: but those of the Church of *Rome*, whilst they would most superstitiously give them that honour

that

that is due to God, most unrighteously deny them that honour that is due unto themselves. Is it an honour to the Prophets, Evangelists and Apostles, to suppress what they writ, said and did, from the greatest part of the Christian World? When our Saviour says upon occasion of a womans bringing a Box of pretious Oyntment, and pouring it upon his head as he sate at meat, *Mat.* 26. 7, 13. *That wheresoever this Gospel should be preached, there should also this that this woman had done, be told for a memorial of her.* The Apostle's counsel is, *Jam.* 5. 10. *Take, my Brethren, the Prophets, who have spoken in the Name of the Lord, for an example of suffering affliction, and of patience.* Now is it an honour to the Prophets for the generality of the people to be kept in such gross ignorance of the holy Scriptures, that it is a wonder if millions of them know what kind of persons the Prophets were, and whether there were such that ever lived in the World? Is it an honour to the Saints departed to aver, that for some time at least, and it is hard to know how long, that they suffer the same pains and torments for substance that the damned suffer in Hell, and that all this time they are deprived of the Beatifical Vision of God's blessed presence in the other World? *Absolom* had rather die than to live in exile, and not see the King's face, 2 *Sam.* 14. 32. *Let me see the King's face, and if there be any iniquity in me, let him kill me.* And is it a small matter for the Saints, for many Generations, to be shut out of the presence of their heavenly Father, and banished from his sight, who is the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords? Thus the pretended honour that the Papists say they give unto the Saints, vanishes into Air and Smoke.

2. That although we have an honour for the blessed Apostles, Saints and Martyrs, yet we dare not give them Religious Honour, no not in any degree whatsoever; for this is due to God, and proper to him alone: when we attribute that to a Creature which is proper and peculiar unto God, we make that a God. Thus *Jacob* to *Rachel* importunately desiring Children, *Gen.* 30. 2. *Jacob's anger was kindled against Rachel, and he said, Am I in God's stead, who hath with-held from thee the fruit of the womb?* Thus also when *Naaman* was sent into *Samaria* to be cured of his Leprosie, and brought a Letter to the King of Israel from the King of *Syria* to that purpose, 2 *King.* 5. 6. *Saying, Now when this Letter is come unto thee, behold, I have therewith sent Naaman my servant to thee, that thou mayst recover him of his Leprosie.* Vers. 7. *It came to pass when the King of Israel had read the Letter, that he rent his cloaths, and said, Am I God, to kill and to make alive, that this man doth send unto me to recover a man of his Leprosie?* Thus it is also in the case of Worship, if we give that Worship to a Creature that is proper unto God, we make it a God. *Exod.* 34. 14. *Thou shalt worship no other gods,* and the reason rendred is this, *For the Lord whose Name is Jealous, is a jealous God.* God's Name is Jealous; and why is his Name so? why is his Name Jealous? Because as men are made known and distinguished

by their names from other men, ſo God is made known by his Name Jealous, and diſtinguiſhed from other gods, from falſe gods: falſe gods were not jealous, though their Lovers and Worſhippers went a whoring after other gods: if they worſhipped them, and ſerved them, all was well enough, they were not jealous. But the Lord our God is a Jealous God, and will not admit of any Co-partner or Rival in his Love, in his Worſhip; *Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve.* Thus much for their worſhipping of Saints.

2. The ſecond thing I ſhall mention is their worſhipping of Images; this is expreſly forbid by the ſecond Commandment. *Exod.* 20. *Thou ſhalt not make unto thee any graven Image, or any likeneſs of any thing that is in Heaven above, or that is in the Earth beneath, or that is in the Water under the Earth: thou ſhalt not bow down thy ſelf to them, nor ſerve them.* That God had a ſpecial regard to Religion in this Commandment, is plain.

1. Becauſe it is ſaid, We are not to bow down our ſelves to them, nor ſerve them.

2. Becauſe this Commandment belongs to the firſt Table, which concerns God's Worſhip and Service, and the Papiſts are tranſgreſſors of this Commandment, for they make unto themſelves Images, and fall down and worſhip them.

And whereas it is urged, That ſuppoſe the Worſhip of the true God by an Image were forbidden by the ſecond Commandment, it would follow indeed from hence, that it was unlawful to worſhip God by an Image, but not that it was Idolatry. This is but a pretence; for to give religious reſpect unto any Creature whatſoever, is Idolatry: now that the Worſhip given by Papiſts unto images is religious, appears, becauſe they tell us, that the worſhip of an Image ſtays not there, but is referred or carried to the Prototype, or thing repreſented by it; and therefore muſt of neceſſity be the ſame in kind that is given to God himſelf: for he that tells you, that he doth it but improperly, indirectly, in this or that manner, acknowledges he doth the thing, and only tells you the manner how; and if the manner doth not deſtroy the thing, then it remains ſtill the ſame kind of Worſhip, and for all theſe diſtinctions it is Idolatry. And beſides, to comply with any way of Worſhip which is not of Divine appointment and inſtitution, is not only a tranſgreſſion of the ſecond Commandment, but ought to be accounted one kind of Idolatry; and the reaſon is this, becauſe hereby we give the honour unto a Creature, which is proper only unto God: for as God alone is to be worſhipped, ſo again he alone can appoint the way or means whereby he will be worſhipped: And this is ſo ſignally a part of his Sovereignty and Authority over his Creature, that implicitely, and by way of interpretation, we make them our God unto whom we ſubmit in any way or kind of Worſhip, which is not of Divine inſtitution. And hence the Iſraelites are ſaid to worſhip Devils, *Levit.* 17. 7. *They ſhall no more offer their*

their Sacrifices unto Devils, after whom they have gone a whoring. Not that the Devil was at best directly the Object of their Worship, but because he hath a great stroke in bringing into the World all kind of false Worship, and men in conformity hereunto pay him that observance and homage that is proper unto God, and in that respect may be said to Worship the Devil.

Our Adversaries plead for themselves, that they worship not a false god, nor the Image of any false god, but the sacred Images of Saints and Angels, and the blessed Virgin *Mary*, and the like, and that adoration must and ought to be given to those, and that for their sakes whom they represent: but if religious respect or honour be given to an Image for the sake of him whom it represents, this is an unquestionable Argument against the worshipping of Images: for seeing it is certain that no Religious Worship is due unto the Saints themselves, much less may it be given to an Image for their sakes.

And here I shall take an occasion to give you an account of what the *Council of Trent* says concerning Images, Sess. 25. *That the Images of Christ, and of the blessed Virgin-Mother of God, and other Saints, are to be kept and reserved, especially in Churches, and due honour and veneration to be given to them,* (by honour and veneration I suppose they mean more than civil) *not for that any Divinity or Virtue is believed to be in them, for which they are to be worshipped, or that any thing is to be asked of them, or any confidence to be placed in them, as was antiently done by the Heathens, who put their trust in Idols, but because the honour which is exhibited to Images is referred to the Prototype, or thing represented by them: So that by the Image which we kiss, and before which we kneel or put off our Hats, we adore Christ, and reverence his Saints, whom the said Images represent.* Thus that *Council.* Now let us see whether the Jews might not have had the same or the like plea for the purging of themselves from Idolatry in their worshipping the Brazen Serpent in *Hezekiah*'s time. When the Brazen Serpent had not that healing Virtue unto which it was designed by God at first, might not they have said that they gave due honour and veneration to the Brazen Serpent, not for that any Divinity or Virtue was believed to be in it, or that any thing was to be asked of it, or any confidence to be placed in it, but in memory of those great and wonderful Cures that had formerly been wrought by it, and that by the appointment and institution of God himself, and what they did, was rather in honour to God, than unto it; and whatever veneration was given to the Brazen Serpent, it was for God's sake, and was ultimately to be resolved upon him. Let the Papists look to it, whether they have a better plea for themselves in their pretended due honour and veneration that they give unto Images, than the Jews had for their Idolatrous practices.

If any should say, But doth not Nature teach us, that the honour or dishonour done to a Picture or Image, reflects upon the person repre-

ſented by it? Is it not an honour to a Prince to kiſs his Picture, and a diſhonour to abuſe it, or deface it? And therefore is it not an honour to God to do the like, and to give due veneration and adoration unto his Image? For anſwer to this, take into your Conſideration theſe following particulars.

1. That it is ſuppoſed by this Quereſt, that an Image or Picture may be made of God, which ought to be denied, and not taken for granted: *Eſay* 40. 17. *All Nations before him are as nothing, and they are counted to him leſs than nothing and vanity:* And it follows, Verſ. 18. *To whom then will ye liken God? or what likeneſs will ye compare unto him?* And why ſhould we make an Image of God that is not like him? But our Adverſaries tell us, That Images or Pictures made with reference unto God, may be conſidered two ways: In a proper ſenſe, as if a man ſhould conceive God to have eyes, and ears, and hands, and other bodily parts as we have, and repreſent him accordingly by an Image; and this our Adverſaries themſelves acknowledge to be an infinite diſparagement unto the Divine Nature, becauſe God being infinite and inviſible, can by no means be repreſented as he is in himſelf by any corporeal likeneſs or figure: Or in a metaphorical and alluſive ſenſe, as repreſenting ſuch things as bear a certain analogy or proportion to ſome Divine Properties, and thereupon are apt to raiſe our minds to the knowledge and contemplation of the Perfections themſelves; as when God appeared to *Daniel* as the *Antient of Days*, this was to manifeſt his Wiſdom and Eternity; and the *Holy Ghoſt* as a Dove, this was to ſignifie his Purity and Simplicity. Now, ſay they, to make an Image of God in this ſenſe, is no way diſhonourable to him, becauſe it is not made to repreſent the Divine Nature by an immediate or proper ſimilitude, but by analogy only, or metaphorical ſignification: and theſe Images are uſually called by way of diſtinction Symbolical Images of God. Unto which we ſay,

1. That the making of any Image of God is forbidden in Scripture: *Deut.* 4. 15. *Take good heed unto your ſelves, for ye ſaw no manner of ſimilitude in the day that the Lord ſpake to you in Horeb out of the midſt of the fire*; Verſ. 16. *Leſt ye corrupt your ſelves, and make you a graven Image, the ſimilitude of any figure, the likeneſs of male or female:* where God did not forbid them the making of the Images of falſe gods, or that any veneration or worſhip ſhould be given unto them; this is plain from the Text, *Ye ſaw no manner of ſimilitude*; the meaning is not that they ſaw no ſimilitude of any falſe god, but of the God that ſpake to them in *Horeb*; whereupon the Lord gives them this caution, *Take ye therefore good heed to your ſelves, leſt ye corrupt your ſelves, or make you a graven Image, the ſimilitude of any figure*, &c.

If it be ſaid, That they were to take heed leſt they corrupted themſelves by making an Image of God, in a proper ſenſe, as is before explained, but they were not forbidden to make a Symbolical Image of God; It is replyed,

1. I demand, Where there is any ground in that Text for such a distinction between a proper and a Symbolical Image of God? The words of the Law are comprehensive & general, *Take heed lest you corrupt your selves, or make you a graven Image, the similitude of any figure:* and the reason rendred by God is, *for you saw no manner of similitude in the day the Lord spake to you in Horeb.* Mark, no manner of similitude, no not so much as Symbolical.

2. Such an Image of God is forbidden, that we are to take great heed to our selves lest we corrupt our selves in the making of it: Now there is no such great danger for a man to represent God to himself by an Image in a proper sense, as if God had eyes, and hands, and feet, as we have, at least such are not in danger that are any thing acquainted with the holy Scriptures, which expresly tell us, that *God is a Spirit*, and that *he will be worshipped in spirit and in truth.* 'Tis to be feared indeed, that the poor ignorant Laity amongst the Papists may be in some danger by this means: but knowing persons amongst the Protestants, even those of the Laity, are not. If it be said, it is true, the people of Israel saw no similitude on the day that God spake to them in *Horeb*, but afterwards God made himself known to them by outward figures and similitudes; to *Daniel*, as the Ancient of Days, to our Saviour in the shape of a Dove; and besides, the parts and members of man's body, are sometimes in Scripture ascribed unto God, as eyes, and hands, and feet, *&c.* and why may not we represent God as he hath been pleased to represent himself? To this it is replyed, That God may, as he pleaseth, make known himself unto his people by some visible tokens of his extraordinary presence. But then consider,

1. That which God was pleased to do sometimes for holy reasons best known unto himself, is not the Rule of our actions, the Word of God is a sufficient Rule, and the only Rule; and if we would know what sin is, and what duty is, we must take our measures from thence: That in matters of Worship we may sin, in imitating God himself otherwise than he hath commanded in his Word; We have a famous instance for this in *Jeroboam*, 1 Reg. 12. 32. *Jeroboam ordained a feast in the eighth month, on the fifteenth day of the month, like unto the feast that is in Judah*; and yet you see he is branded for this by the Spirit of God in the Scriptures.

2. We never read that *Moses* and the Prophets took care that any Figure or Image should be made of God, no not a Symbolical Image; and it is very strange that they should be so much wanting to themselves, and to the Generation wherein they lived, if they were such excellent helps to Devotion, as some pretend.

3. Though God sometimes by outward Figures and Similitudes gave notice of his extraordinary presence, yet it was to persons eminent for holiness, and of great and singular wisdom in Divine things, as *Abraham*, *Moses*, *Daniel*, and such like Worthies, and such as were able to give a right judgment of things of this nature: but when God spake unto the people in *Horeb* out of the midst of the fire, they saw no manner of

of similitude, lest they might corrupt themselves in the making of a graven Image, and might have gross and carnal notions concerning God: And indeed I cannot but wonder at our Adversaries, when they call Images Lay-mens Books, or the Books of the unlearned: Had the use of Images been appropriated to the more knowing and learned persons, it would have been more tolerable, there might be some pretence that such persons might from sensible and material representations be raised up to divine and heavenly meditation, even of things surpassing sense: but to conceive that the vulgar and ignorant sort of people, (and the generality of people are so, and ought to be so according to the Popish Principles) I say, to think that they who are in a manner made up altogether of sense, should be taught to worship an infinite, spiritual, invisible Being, by fixing their eyes upon finite corporeal Objects of sense, seems to me to be the first-born of incredibilities.

And whereas it is said that we cannot conceive of God but by forming Ideas of him in our minds, which are so many Pictures and Representations of God: this is true; but then withal we must consider, that these Forms and Representations of God in our fancies, arise from our natural constitution, from our finite and corporeal nature, and ought to be bewailed, and therefore is no argument for worshipping God in any corporeal Form; for this may betray us so much the more to gross and undue notions and conceptions concerning God; nor are our imaginations to guide our understanding, but our understandings must rectifie and regulate our imaginations.

4. These outward figures and signs of God's special and extraordinary presence, continued only for a time, and for some extraordinary service for which God had designed them, and then disappeared; and it is absurd for any to think, that which was by peculiar and extraordinary dispensation, should become a constant and ordinary rule unto all Generations.

5. 'Tis true, that the parts and members of man's body are sometimes ascribed unto God in Scripture, as eyes, and hands, and feet, *&c.* but it is ridiculous from Tropes, and Metaphors, and Figurative Expressions, to form an argument for Pictures and Images: for if so, we may represent God as the Sun, as a Fountain, as Fire, as a Rock; and Christ as an Hen with Chickens under his Wings; for these are ascribed to God and Christ in Scripture; and yet I conceive that Papists themselves would not give any countenance to Pictures of this nature. Unto which might be added, that it is not likely that we should be misled into errour by such passages as those, when the Scripture elsewhere tells us expressly that *God is a Spirit:* but these pretended Images of God speak not, nor give us any notice of our danger. Yea, in those very places of Scripture, at least some of them, where eyes, and hands, and feet are ascribed unto God, we may find enough to prove that God is infinite and incomprehensible: for instance, when it is said that *Heaven*

is

is God's Throne, and the *Earth his Footstool*, where at first view it seems to be insinuated, as if God had feet, and made use of the Earth as his Footstool; yet if we seriously consider the whole as it is ascribed unto God, we shall find that it plainly enough speaks God to be an infinite Being: for when it is said, that the whole *Heaven is God's Throne*, and the whole *Earth his Footstool*, it would not only be absurd, but monstrously ridiculous for any to conceive, that a body like unto mans should be capable of such qualifications, as at the same time to make Heaven its Throne, and the Earth its Footstool. So when God is said to deliver Israel *by a mighty hand, and a stretched-out arm*, there is no man can understand it thus, as if God stretched forth his Arm out of Heaven upon the Earth for the deliverance of his people, but that by God's Arm is meant God's Power, and that it is called his Hand or Arm improperly, and after the manner of men: thus the holy Scriptures have well provided for the people of God against errours and mistakes concerning God. But how the pretended Images of God may acquit themselves in this particular, our Adversaries should do well to advise: And therefore let me caution you in God's Name, lest you corrupt your selves in making any graven Image of God; and I do it so much the rather, because men have a great fancy to have a God that they may see with their eyes, or at least some visible representations of God; for they think if he should be out of sight, he would be out of mind also. And hence Papists, and Popishly affected persons are more for being at Mass, than for hearing of a Sermon; they had rather see their God, than hear another speak eloquently of him; and therefore take heed lest ye corrupt your selves in this kind. And this is the first thing that I would say to this enquiry, Whether it be not an honour to God that due Veneration and Adoration be given to his Image or Picture, namely, that this supposes that an Image or Picture may be made of God, which we deny.

2. The second thing that I would say by way of reply to this enquiry, is this, That civil honour may be paid to the Images of Kings and Princes, but it doth not follow from hence that the Images of Christ and of the Saints may have a religious respect paid to them: the Images of Kings and Princes are civil things, and therefore may have civil honour; if the Images of Christ and the Saints were sacred, as the other are civil, there might be some colour for what they say; but that they are sacred or holy, is to be proved, and till then we leave it to our Adversaries to take it into consideration.

3. That it is granted that the abuse or the defacing of the Image of a Prince, redounds to the dishonour of that Prince whom it represents; but I hope no indignity is offered to a Prince by breaking apieces those Pictures that he had expressly forbidden should be graven, or painted, or made, and that under a severe penalty: indeed the abuse of those things that are of divine Institution, as of the Elements in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, or the Water in Baptism, doth redound unto God him-

himself; but what is this to an Image of mans devising? and that not only without any warrant from God, but expresly against his will and commandments? If a man should break apieces, or throw into the fire the Coin that comes into his hands that is false or counterfeit, though it had the Princes Image or stamp upon it; yet it would be no dishonour to the Prince to deal so by it, but rather a piece of homage and reverence to his Authority.

For the further clearing of this matter in controversie between us and our Adversaries of *Rome*, concerning the Veneration and Adoration that they say may be given to Images, we will consider that Images may be worshipped two manner of ways.

1. *Terminative*, that is, when people terminate their worship on an Image, as if it were God, without looking any further than it; and this is likely to be the sin of the more brutish sort of the blind Heathens, and of many ignorant Papists to this day; and this kind of Idolatry is forbidden by the first Commandment, this is plain upon this ground; If the first Commandment expresly enjoins us to have no other gods but *Jehovah*, then to worship an Image as God is forbidden by this Commandment; so that by making a graven Image in the second Commandment, and falling down before it, and worshipping of it; something else must be understood than the worshipping of it *terminative* as God; and therefore

2. Images may be worshipped *relative*, and with respect to the true God; and in this sense our Adversaries of the Church of *Rome* would maintain their worship of Images: now this also is unlawful, and forbidden by the second Commandment. In this sense the Papists in our days are guilty of Idolatry, and the Jews of old were guilty of Idolatry; for the Jews, at least many of them, did not worship the Images themselves, but the true God by them; and this will appear by instances out of the sacred Scripture.

1. The first instance that I shall give you, shall be that of the Golden Calf, of which we read *Exod.* 32. That the worshipping of the Calf was Idolatry, is plain 1 *Cor.* 10. 7. *Neither be ye Idolaters, as were some of them, as it is written, The people sate down to eat and drink, and rose up to play*; where the Apostle refers to the peoples worshipping of the Calf, *Exod.* 32. 6. *They rose early on the morrow, and offered burnt-offerings, and brought peace-offerings; and the people sate down to eat and drink, and rose up to play*; and yet the Israelites did not fall into the Heathenish Idolatry by so doing, that is, they did not worship the Calf as God, but worshipped the true God by the Calf. I know the Papists with great bitterness inveigh against the Protestants for teaching of this Doctrine; nor do I wonder at it; for what is like to become of the Popish darling principle of worshipping the true God by an Image, if the Israelites, for doing the same thing according to the judgment of God himself, were Idolaters? Now therefore that which will be proved is

this,

this, That the Israelites did not worship the Calf as God, but the true God by the Calf; and that will appear by these following Considerations.

1. Because the Calf was dedicated and consecrated to the service of the true God, as appears by what *Aaron* said and did in that case, *Exod.* 32. 5. *When Aaron saw it, he built an Altar before it, and Aaron made Proclamation, and said, To morrow is a Feast to the Lord*, or unto *Jehovah*; and *Aaron* useth the Name *Jehovah*, that he might make the best of a bad matter, that the people might not terminate their Worship on the Idol, but on the true God. And our Adversaries seem to yield to the force of this Scripture, when they do acknowledge, that *Aaron* perhaps, and some of the wiser amongst the Israelites, might not be so sottish as to worship the Calf as God: but they should consider also, that *Aaron* did not speak so much his own sense, but by this means would give notice to the people how to regulate and order their devotion; and if they would be so mad as to worship the Calf, in so doing, they should have respect unto the true God, unto *Jehovah*, and worship him by it; and accordingly *he makes Proclamation, and says, To morrow is a Feast to Jehovah.*

If it be said, the Idol was called by the Name *Jehovah*, and therefore they worshipped that as God; we reply, That this is *gratis dictum* said, but not proved: for *Aaron* doth not say, To morrow is a Feast to the Calf *Jehovah*, but, To morrow is a Feast to *Jehovah:* and suppose it were so, that the Calf was called *Jehovah*, this may be understood of that religious Worship and Honour which they gave unto the Calf, which is so proper and peculiar unto God, that either that is God which we thus worship, or else we make it so. *Psal.* 106. 19, 20. 'tis said of Israel, *They made a Calf in Horeb, and worshipped the molten Image: thus they changed their glory into the similitude of an Ox that eateth Grass:* The meaning is not, that the Israelites thought that God in his Nature and Being was like unto an Ox; but by giving the Calf religious honour, by worshipping the graven Image, by giving that glory which is due to God unto an Ox, they did in a sense change their glory into the similitude of an Ox that eateth Grass. Thus when Israel is charged with saying, *Jer.* 2. 27. *to a Stock, Thou art my Father; and a Stone, Thou hast brought me forth*; this is not to be understood strictly; surely they had been grosser Stocks than those that they worshipped, if it entred into their thoughts that a Stock made them, or was their Father, or a Stone brought them forth, but because they gave some religious respect to those Stocks and Stones, they did in a sense change the Glory of God into a Stock, and into a Stone; and by interpretation, *say to a Stock, Thou art my Father; and to a Stone, Thou hast brought me forth.*

2. It further appears, that the Israelites did not worship the Calf it self as God, but the true God by the Calf, as by what *Aaron* said, so by what the people said, *Exod.* 32. 4. *These be thy gods, O Israel, which*

brought thee up out of the Land of Egypt. Now though they ſay gods, becauſe the word in the *Hebrew* is in the plural number; yet according to the uſage of the word in other places of Scripture, we muſt underſtand by it one God, and ſo the Scripture expounds it elſewhere, *Neh.* 9. 18. *This is thy God that brought thee up out of Egypt:* They called the Calf God by an uſual *Metonymy*, by giving of the Name of the thing ſignified unto the ſign; as the *Images* of the Cherubims are called Cherubims, *Exod.* 25. 18. and the *Images* of Oxen are called Oxen, 1 *Reg.* 7. 25. ſo then the meaning of this Scripture is this, *Theſe be thy gods, O Iſrael*; that is to ſay, This is the ſign and token of the preſence of thy God, O Iſrael, that brought thee up out of the Land of *Egypt.* And indeed had the Calf been God, according to the notion of the idolatrous Heathens, the Calf would rather have kept them in *Egypt*, than have brought them out of *Egypt:* for look, as thoſe of the Church of *Rome* have their tutelar Saints, ſome to preſide over ſome Countries, and ſome over others; ſome to be helpful and aſſiſtant in one caſe, and ſome in another: ſo the Heathens had their tutelar and topical gods; the gods of *Egypt* themſelves would not ſtir out of *Egypt*, much leſs were they like to bring Iſrael from thence: the Heathens thought that the whole World was of too large a compaſs for one God to take care of, and therefore their notion was, that ſeveral Countries had ſeveral gods; yea, ſeveral places it may be in one and the ſame Country, had ſeveral gods; *Their gods* (ſays the *Syrians* of the *Iſraelites*) *are gods of the hills*, 1 *Reg.* 20. 23. (poſſibly collecting the ſame from the Jews uſual ſacrificing in high-places) and not the god of the plain, *Let us fight againſt them in the plain, and ſurely we ſhall be ſtronger than they.* It is likely that one god cannot be the god of the hills, and the god of the plain; and hence it is that the people that the King of *Aſſyria* ſent to the Cities of *Samaria*, and placed there, are ſaid not to know the manner of the God of the Land, *i. e.* the God of *Iſrael*, as diſtinct from the God of *Judah*, 2 *Reg.* 17. 26. Theſe were the notions that the Heathens had of their gods; and therefore if the Iſraelites were ſuch groſs Idolaters as our Adverſaries pretend they were, how could they ſay, *Theſe are thy gods, O Iſrael, that brought thee up out of the Land of Egypt?*

3. It appears yet further, that the Iſraelites did not worſhip the Calf it ſelf as God, but the true God by the Calf, from that Text of Scripture, *Act.* 7. 41, 42. *They made a Calf in thoſe days, and offered ſacrifice unto the Idols, and rejoyced in the works of their own hands.* Verſ. 42. *Then God turned, and gave them up to worſhip the Hoſt of Heaven.* It is ſaid, that ſacrifice notes the higheſt piece of Worſhip and Devotion; this is ſaid, but it is more than evident that the Iſraelites had a reſpect to the true God, even when they offered ſacrifice unto the Idol: for it is ſaid, when the Iſraelites offered ſacrifice unto the Calf, that *God gave them up to worſhip the Hoſt of Heaven.* Now if their Idolatry had conſiſted in worſhipping the Calf as God, it will be found to be more groſs

and

and absurd than to worship the Host of Heaven, at least it could not have been an aggravation of their sin that they worshipped the Host of Heaven, above their worshipping of the Calf, which is St. *Stephen*'s scope in this place: the meaning therefore of this Scripture is this, that because they corrupted the worship of the true God in worshipping of the Calf, contrary to his command, therefore God in judgment gave them up to the worshipping of those that were not gods, namely, the Host of Heaven.

But is it not said, That *they forgat God their Saviour?* Psal. 106.21. and doth not this imply that they had renounced the worship of the true God, and worshipped the Calf as God? I answer, No; this must not be understood as if they did not remember *God* at all; no, nor yet the great things which he had done in *Egypt:* but they are said to forget him, because they were not mindful of his Precepts, and had no regard unto his Laws; and particularly that Law, *Thou shalt not make to thy self any graven Image.* They also do not obey God, that do not as they ought remember God; and in this sense the Israelites are said to forget God, not because they worshipped the Calf as a false god, but transgressed, in worshipping of the Calf, the Law of the true God.

But what need had the Israelites of the Calf, as a sign of God's presence going before them, when they had already the Pillar of Cloud by day, and the Pillar of Fire by night, designed by God for this very end? But what trifling is this? What need had they to long after the Garlick and Onions of *Egypt*, when God had provided for them *Manna*, the food of Angels, bread from Heaven? What need had *David* to contrive the death of his good subject *Uriah*, and after this to marry *Bathsheba* his Wife? Yea, what need have the Papists themselves of Crucifixes, when they have the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, Memoirs of Divine appointment and institution of *Christ*'s Death and Passion? Would it not be ridiculous to say they had no need to do it, therefore they did it not?

And supposing that the people should be so stupid, as some pretend they were, as to think that there was a Divine Virtue inherent in the Calf; yet this doth not prove that they worshipped the *Calf* as God: for if so, the Jews might conclude that the Hem of Christ's Garment, and the Handkerchief and shadow of the Apostles were gods, because a Divine Virtue seemed to go forth from them: yea, and the Brazen Serpent might be thought to have been God, because the stung Israelite was healed by looking up to the Brazen Serpent.

And whereas it is urged that the Israelites served the gods of the *Egyptians* whilst they were in *Egypt*, Josh. 24. 14. *Now therefore fear the Lord, and serve him in sincerity and in truth, and put away the gods which your fathers served on the other side of the flood, and in Egypt:* And the Scripture speaking of Israel, tells us, *Psal.* 106. 19. *They made a Calf in Horeb, and worshipped the molten Image.* In answer to this, we say,

That it is not unusual for God to charge a people going on in ways of wickedness and disobedience, with that which is suitable enough with what they do, and the intention of the work, though far enough off from the design and intention of the Worker: Thus the Apostle tells us, That Covetousness is Idolatry, and that there are some that make their Belly their God, and yet the persons concerned far enough off either from professing or designing any thing of this nature. Thus the Israelites *made a Calf in Horeb, and worshipped the molten Image*, because they gave religious worship to it, though their design and intention was far different from the Idolatry of the Heathens, that worshipped Idols, or false gods. Thus I have endeavoured to clear the first instance that may be given of the Jews committing Idolatry by their worshipping of Images, though they did not worship the Images themselves, but the true God by them; and having been so large in this, there needs but a few words to be spoken to the rest.

2. A second instance may be that of *Jeroboam*, in his infamous sin in setting up Calves at *Dan* and *Bethel*, whereby he made Israel to sin: Now it was not *Jeroboam*'s design to withdraw the people altogether from the worship of the true God, or the worshipping of those *Calves* as gods, but to worship the true God by them; and that for these Reasons.

1. The great design of *Jeroboam* in this, was, that he might secure the Ten Tribes unto himself, so that they might not think of returning to unite themselves any more to the House of *David*, which might possibly come to pass by their going up to *Jerusalem*, as appears from 1 *King.* 12. 26. *And Jeroboam said in his heart, Now shall the Kingdom return to the House of David.* Vers. 27. *If this people go up to do sacrifice in the House of the Lord at Jerusalem, then shall the heart of this people return again unto their Lord, even unto Rehoboam King of Judah, and they shall kill me, and go again to Rehoboam King of Judah:* and hence that saying of his, Vers. 28. *It is too much for you to go up to Jerusalem*; as if he should say, Ye may worship God nearer home.

2. That it was not *Jeroboam*'s design to withdraw the people altogether from the worship of the true God, will further appear, because the Idolatry of *Jeroboam* is distinguished from the Idolatry of the Heathens abroad that worshipped false gods, yea from the Idolatry of their Idolatrous Kings at home, as that of *Ahab*, 1 *Reg.* 16. 30. *And Ahab the son of Omri did evil in the sight of the Lord above all that were before him:* so that *Ahab*'s Idolatry was more heinous than *Jeroboam*'s; and what other reason can likely be rendred for it than this, namely, *Ahab*'s setting up of false gods? for whereas it is pretended that *Ahab*'s sin was greater than *Jeroboam*'s, because *Ahab*'s sin was the worshipping of many gods, whereas *Jeroboam*'s sin was worshipping the *Calf:* as he is a greater and more heinous sinner that commits Adultery with many, than he that committs it but with one. This is but a pretence, for it remains

remains to be proved, that the Israelites did at any time, yea in the worst of times, altogether renounce the true and living God, but in their conceit, yea and in their profession acknowledge the true God still: and hence it is that you shall read, that *Ahab*'s Prophets that were the Prophets of *Baal*, did yet Prophesie in the Name of the Lord, 1 *Reg.*22.11. *And Zedekiah the son of Chenaanah made him horns of Iron, and he said, Thus saith the Lord, With these shalt thou push the Syrians until thou have consumed them:* and Vers.12. *All the Prophets prophesied so, saying, Go up to Ramoth-Gilead and prosper, for the Lord will deliver it into the Kings hand.* So that the difference between *Jeroboam*'s and *Ahab*'s Idolatry lay here; *Jeroboam*'s Idolatry consisted in worshipping of the true God by an Image; but *Ahab*'s Idolatry was not only in worshipping the true God by an Image as *Jeroboam*'s did, but in worshipping other gods besides him, namely, *Baal*-gods.

3. A third instance might be that of *Michah* and his Mother, *Judg.* 17. though his Mother made a graven Image, yet that it was for the worshipping of the God of Israel, appears by the whole story: she professes, Vers. 3. that she had wholly dedicated the silver that was to make a graven Image and a molten Image unto the Lord; and *Micah* himself consecrates a Levite for his Priest, *viz.* seeming thereby to have respect to the true God in the worship he had designed; and when he had done so, he professes, Vers. 13. *Now know I that the Lord will do me good, seeing I have a Levite to my Priest:* yet upon this account his Mother and himself also were Idolaters.

As we may take notice of the Superstition and Idolatry, so of the fraud and treachery of the Church of *Rome*, in leaving the second Commandment, or at least the far greatest part of it, out of some of their Books: for this I shall mention their *Roman Catechism*, authorized by the *Council of Trent*, and Published by the Edict of Pope *Pius* the Fifth, where, speaking of the first Commandment (for Papists make first and second to be but one) they recite it thus, *Thou shalt have no other gods before me, Thou shalt not make to thy self any graven Image*, and supply the rest with an *&c.* As also a Book called *Manipulas Curatorum*, containing in brief the Offices of Priests, according to the order of seven Sacraments, by *Guido de Monte*, written *Anno Dom.* 1333. where the second Commandment is wholly omitted. As also a Book called *Opusculum Tripartitum de Præceptis Decalogi de Confessione, & Arte Moriendi*, by *John Gerson* Chancellor of *Paris*. Now this is an horrible piece of fraud and treachery, and accordingly disowned and decreed by the Reformed Churches. *Use* 2.

Now for the further clearing and more distinct understanding of this matter, it will become us to take into Consideration, that this is granted on all hands, that there are *Ten Commandments* of the Moral Law, called therefore the *Decalogue*; and that these *Ten Commandments* are divided into *Two Tables*; but how many belong unto the *First Table*, and

and how many unto the *Second*, that indeed is a question. The *Protestants*, or those that may be called *Calvinists* in opposition to the *Lutherans*, ascribe *Four Commandments* to the *First Table*, and *Six to the Second:* The *Papists* and *Lutherans* making the First and Second Commandment to be but one, ascribe *Three Commandments* to the *First Table*, and *Seven* to the *Second*; and to make up the number of Ten, divide that which we call the Tenth Commandment, into two, the one, *Thou shalt not covet thy Neighbours House*, and the other, *Thou shalt not covet thy Neighbours Wife, nor his Man-servant*, &c. Now this distinction of the Commandments, together with their presumptuous leaving out of the *Second Commandment* out of the *Decalogue*, is not allowed by the Churches called Reformed, for these Reasons.

1. Because by this means they sacrilegiously take away a Commandment of God, relating to his Worship and Service: for as by the first Commandment we are forbidden to worship false gods, or the Images of false gods; so by the second Commandment we are forbidden to worship the true God in a false way, or after a false manner; and in particular the worshipping of Images, or the worshipping of the true God by an Image. Now they of the Church of *Rome* being aware of this, and that they might have a covert for their Idolatrous Worship, make the first and second Commandment to be but one, and presumptuously leave the second Commandment out of the Decalogue.

2. That supposing the second Commandment (for so we say it is) was only an Appendix to the first, and an Explication of it, yet it is an horrible presumption to leave this Explication out of their Books, and particularly out of their Catechism. The Law of God ought to be made known unto the people, perfect and entire, as it was delivered by God himself: Surely God hath not given to any, no not to the best and wisest amongst the sons of men, the power of a *Deleatur*, with reference to his holy and blessed Law. And if that which we say is the second Commandment, may be razed out of our Books because it is an Explication of the first, by the same reason we may blot out the whole tenth Commandment out of the Decalogue, because it is an Explication of the whole Moral Law, and especially of the second Table, according to the notice given us by Christ himself, *Mat.* 5.28. *I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.*

And whereas it is urged, that in the rehearsal of the Commandment, our Saviour himself doth not keep exactly to the words and syllables as you have them upon record, *Exod.*20. nor to the same order as *Mat. 19.* 16. when one came to Christ, and said to him, *Good Master, what good thing may I do that I may have eternal life?* Our Saviour answers him, Vers. 17. *If thou wilt enter into life, keep the Commandments*; and Vers. 18. *When he saith unto him, Which?* Christ answers, *Thou shalt do no murder: Thou shalt not commit adultery: Thou shalt not steal: Thou shalt*

shalt not bear false witness: and Vers. 19. *Honour thy Father and thy Mother.* And thus *Moses* reciting the Commandments, interserts something when he speaks of the fourth Commandment, *Deut.* 5. 12, 13, 14, 15. *Keep the Sabbath-day to sanctifie it, as the Lord thy God hath commanded thee,* &c. Vers. 15. *And remember that thou wast a servant in the Land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand, and by a stretched-out arm; therefore the Lord thy God hath commanded thee to keep the Sabbath-day:* All this must be acknowledged; but then there is a difference between doing this sometime, and upon occasion, and to do it frequently and designedly; and where there are but Ten Commandments, most sacrilegiously and irreverently to deprive the people of one of them.

3. No sufficient reason can be rendred, why that which we say is the tenth Commandment, should be divided into two, but rather that it is one, and no more; and that the purport and scope of this Commandment is, to forbid the coveting of any thing that is our Neighbours: and if we may take the boldness to make the coveting of our Neighbours House one Commandment, and the coveting of our Neighbours Wife another, we may by the same reason make another of coveting our Neighbours Servant, and another of coveting his Ox, or his Ass, and so make twelve or thirteen Commandments, or rather as many Commandments as the things are that we covet. In a word, the Papists wilful declining the printing and publishing the second Commandment for the peoples use, doth give any impartial Observer sufficient cause to suspect that they themselves take it to be against their cause; and supposing that it should be granted, that three Commandments belong to the first Table, and seven to the second, yet it looks like a piece of fraud and unfaithfulness to suppress any thing of the Law, concerning which our Saviour tells us, that not one *Iota* or tittle of it shall fall to the ground.

Is this, Learn from hence that there is a sweet harmony, and suitableness, and correspondency between Divine Truths delivered unto us in the Old Testament, and in the New. *Moses* in *Deuteronomy* teacheth us, *to fear the Lord our God, and serve him:* our *Saviour* in St. *Matthew* teaches us, *that we must worship the Lord our God, and him only must we serve.* Take the Word of God, whether you consider the Old Testament or the New, the incomparable fitness and proportion of the Truths and Doctrines contained in them one unto another, is one great Character of the Divinity of the Scriptures; and therefore those Doctrines that are urged as matters of Faith, and yet have no suitableness and correspondency with those Principles which are owned and acknowledged to be Divine Truths, but justle with them, and may be considered apart, and in a separate way from them, are to be suspected for delusions and mistakes. I shall take my liberty here (though not designed for the management of that subject) to instance in the Doctrine of *Use 3.*

Transub-

Transubstantiation: We tell our Adversaries, that if we deny our senses in those things wherein it is proper for them to give a judgment, (as we must in case we believe that the Sacramental Elements, after Consecration, are transubstantiated into the very Body and Blood of Christ) then all Religion will fall to the ground, we cannot certainly know either what we read, or what we hear; nor could they that lived in our Saviour's time, certainly know that there was such a person living upon the earth, and all the Miracles that he wrought, for ought they knew, might be Delusions, and a meer deception of their senses: so that if sense was not to be believed, Christianity it self must have fallen to the ground. This cannot be denied: but then they say that this one instance of Transubstantiation ought to be excepted from the general Rule, and ought to have its place apart, and in this particular case our senses ought to be over-ruled. Now this, amongst other things, makes the Doctrine of Transubstantiation to be suspected, because it hath not a suitableness to other matters, whereby the Verity of Christian Religion was proved and made good unto the World. Look as it is in other cases, consider the work of God, there appears a marvellous correspondence between them; the World hath its parts so united one to another, that neither the Heaven, nor the Earth, nor any of the Elements can be taken away without the ruine of the whole: And thus it is with the Principles of Christian Religion, and especially the great Truths of Christianity; take away one, and you in a manner take away all the rest. For instance, The Doctrine of the Trinity hath many Principles of Christianity that fall in with it, the Incarnation of the Son of God falls in with it, the Death and Passion of the Son of God falls in with it, the Satisfaction of the Son of God made unto Divine Justice falls in with it: But you may take away the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, and all the Principles of Christian Religion will remain unshaken, yea untoucht, the Doctrine of the Sacraments not excepted: the Sacrament of Baptism will not suffer in the least by it, no nor the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper its self; for if Baptism be a Sacrament without Transubstantiation, why may not the Lord's Supper also? But this I take notice of only *in transitu*, and by the way, and so pass on.

Use 4. Let this caution us against Superstition, and all False-Worship: It is the great Interest and Concern of the Church of Christ, to keep the Worship of God pure and uncorrupt. 'Tis to be acknowledged that Satan is a great enemy to the Truths of God, as well as to the Worship of God; yet his design is rather that the Worship of God be corrupted, than the Truths of God be perverted: for he knows that it is possible for Religion to be depraved in some points, and yet many may keep themselves from defilement, and may not be tainted with the errours of the place where they live, or the Church unto which they do belong, provided the Worship of God be kept pure and uncorrupt: but if once the Worship of God be publickly corrupted by Superstition and Idolatry,

it

it is next to an impossibility if the infection do not spread over the face of the whole Church, and by consequence there can be no Communion with that Church without sin; and hence the great business of Popery is coming to Mass. It may be some Papists, at least such as are moderate, may allow you to adhere to some Protestant Principles, if you will come to the Mass; but that is indispensable.

As this should caution us against False-Worship in the general, so against worshipping of God by an Image in particular. God is very jealous lest his Worship should be given unto Images, and hence none of the Commandments are grounded upon his jealousie but the second, which is against Images, and we are very prone to Superstition and Will-worship in this kind. God expresseth himself most largely in the second and fourth Commandments, because men are more than ordinary inclinable to be transgressors of these two: A man is easily counselled that he must not kill, that he must not steal; but that God is to be worshipped only in that way which he hath prescribed in his Word, and that the Lord's Day, the Christian Sabbath, is to be kept holy, this may be enforced upon us, and we had need of line upon line to further us in these Duties; as where the Tyde is wont to run, and bear up with greater force and violence than is usual in other places, the banks that are made for the preventing of the breaking in of the water, had need to be made so much the higher and the stronger: And whereas it is said that Idols may not be worshipped, but Images may; it is high presumption to distinguish where God hath not: the second Commandment tells us, *that we are not to make to our selves any graven Image, or the likeness of any thing*; and it expresly forbids us, *to fall down before it, and worship it:* and surely it must needs be of dangerous consequence in things that concern God's Worship and Service, to endeavour to elude the force and power of any Law of God by a distinction of our own devising. *Use 5.*

Is to counsel you to keep your selves from Idols; thus St. *John*, 1 *Joh.* 5. 21. *Little Children, keep your selves from Idols.* Idols, what are they? Some will tell you, that there is this difference between an Image and an Idol: An Image, say they, is a representation of something that hath a real being and existence; an Idol, of something that is feigned, and hath no being but in the minds and fancies of men; and that is the meaning, say they, of that place of Scripture, 1 *Cor.* 8. 4. *We know that an Idol is nothing in the World*; but this is a strange mistake: It is true, the Apostle says, *an Idol is nothing*; but how? not in respect of the matter of it, for so it is something, Gold, or Silver, or Stone; no, nor in regard of the thing represented by it; for an Idol doth not always represent things feigned, and such as have no existence but in the imaginations of men, as Sphynxes, Tritons, Centaurs, and the like, but many times things that are real, things that are in Heaven, and things that are on Earth, as they are mentioned in the second Commandment. Nor is it to be imagined that amongst those multitudes of *Use 6*

Images which were worshipped by the Heathens, but that some of them at least might represent such things as had a real being and existence; and yet all such as were worshipped by them, are expressly by the Apostle called Idols, 1 *Cor.* 12. 2. *Ye know that ye were Gentiles, carried away unto these dumb Idols, even as ye were led:* but the meaning of the Apostle is this, an Idol is nothing in point of virtue and efficacy, nothing at all conducing unto Salvation; and in particular, that it hath no power at all either to sanctifie or to pollute those meats which were offered unto them, of which the Apostle speaks in that Chapter. An Idol is said to be nothing in the same sense as Circumcision is said to be nothing, and Uncircumcision nothing, 1 *Cor.* 7. 19. that is, in point of virtue and efficacy; and so the Apostle explains himself elsewhere, *Gal.* 5. 6. *For in Christ Jesus neither Circumcision availeth any thing, nor Uncircumcision, but Faith that worketh by love:* the *formale* of an Idol consists in this, that it is religiously worshipped, insomuch that which was no Idol before, immediately upon its being worshipped becomes an Idol: Thus the Brazen Serpent, that was no Idol before, upon its being worshipped became an Idol: Thus it was with the Sun, and Moon, and Stars, when the people worshipped them, and burnt incense to them, they became Idols.

Now the counsel that I give you, or rather St. *John*, is this, *Keep your selves from Idols:* They that would not be Idolaters, must keep themselves from Idols, from all things that may be enticements to that sin: in the Commandments where a sin is forbidden, all enticements and provocations to that sin are also forbidden. When God says, *Thou shalt not commit adultery*, the meaning of this Commandment, according to the Exposition that our Saviour himself makes of it, is, that we must not *look upon a woman to lust after her.* And *Solomon* speaking of an Harlot, gives this counsel, *Prov.* 5. 8. *Remove thy way far from her, and come not nigh the door of her house:* And holy *Job*, *made a covenant with his eyes, not to think upon a Maid*, Job 31. 1. When God would forbid the sin of injustice, see how he expresses it, *Deut.* 25. 13. *Thou shalt not have in thy bag divers weights, a great and a small.* It was a sin for a man to have a great and a small weight in his bag; and why so? Suppose a great and a small weight were found in a mans bag, he might say, How doth it appear that I have sold Wares by one weight, and taken up Wares by another? But God would not have them lay such a snare before themselves, and therefore forbids them to have in their bags divers weights, a great and a small: So it is in this case, when we have a caution given us against Idols, *Little Children, keep your selves from Idols.* The Holy Ghost seems to meet with a secret Objection that might be made by some: We hate Idolatry, but yet to have Images to put us in mind of God, and to quicken our Devotion, provided we give them not religious Worship as others do, we hope there is no harm in this. Yes, there is: you must not only keep your selves from Idolatry,

but

but you must keep your selves from Idols. Those of the Church of *Rome* charge Protestants as if they had a mind to abolish and root out of the minds of men, the memory of the blessed Apostles, Confessors, and Martyrs, by inveighing against sacred Images, and holy Reliques: but this is just as if a man should take upon him the boldness to say, That because God buried the Body of *Moses*, *in a Valley in the Land of Moab, and no man knoweth of his Sepulchre to this day*, Deut. 34. 6. that God's design in all this was to blot out the Memorials of *Moses* from the face of the whole Earth.

Let us pray unto God, that he would famish all the gods of the Earth; famishing of Idols is a Scripture-phrase, *Zeph.* 2. 11. *The Lord will be terrible unto them, for he will famish all the gods of the earth, and men shall worship him.* The Psalmist speaking of God's Providence over his Creatures, tells us, *Psal.* 145. 15. *The eyes of all wait upon thee, and thou givest them their meat in due season:* but an Idol is none of God's Creatures, an Idol hath eyes and sees not, ears and hears not, mouth and and tastes not. But you will say, How then can God famish them? Thus: If we would know what it is to famish the gods of the Earth, then we must consider what their meat is; their meat is that Worship, and Service, and Honour, which is given them by the sons of men; Now when God is made the sole Object of Religious Worship, when men turn from dumb Idols to serve the living God, and him only, then God famishes the gods of the Earth, takes away their meat from them, and then men shall worship him, and let all good people say, *Amen. So be it.* *Use* 7.

SERMON XIV.

Mr Peter Vink

Protestants separated for Christ's Names sake.

Luke 6. 22. *Blessed are ye when men shall hate you, and when they shall separate you, and shall reproach you, and cast out your Name as evil for the Son of man's sake.*

ONe of the main designs of the Doctrine of the Gospel, is to unite men one to another, and to tie them together with the strongest bonds and ligaments imaginable. To this purpose it does not only forbid the doing of any wrong unto others, but it prescribes Rules for the curbing of our passions when provoked by them. Nay, it peremptorily enjoins, under the severest penalties, that we should forgive the offences done against us, and love the persons of them that do them. And that we might think it our greatest concern thus to do, it combines and gathers all, *who have any hope toward God*, into one *Body*, which is called *the Church*, who are jointly to profess *one Faith*, and to perform *one Worship*, and to serve *one Lord*: the Ligaments whereby this Body is united and tied together, being the *Sacraments*, for this end also appointed by *Christ*.

Ephes. 4. 4, 5.

Who being the *Lord of all*, is yet pleased more especially to relate to this *Body*, as its *Head*, for Direction and Government, and to influence it by his Spirit for life and motion. Now it being full as monstrous for one Head to have two Bodies, as for one Body to have two Heads. So far forth as any have hoped for Salvation by Christ, they have also pretended to belong to that *One Body*, of which he is the Head and Saviour.

In these pretensions the *Church of Rome* comes not behind any, but with as much passion, and as little reason as they of old, whom the Prophet speaks of, they cry out too, *The Temple of the Lord, the Temple of the Lord, the Temple of the Lord* are these. Nay, so unreasonable are they in arrogating to themselves the priviledge of this *Body*, that they challenge (as the *Donatists* before them) to be the *whole*, and not a *part* of it; confounding, for to save this their purpose, things so discrepant as the *Catholick* and *Romish Church*, (that is, the universal and a particular

Jerem. 7. 4.

cular Church) and at last the Church and the Pope too are with them but one and the same, all others being but Cyphers, and meer Insignificants to him.

And this I account none of the least reasons to suspect that they have *no part nor share* in what they so much pretend unto: for 'tis too too apparent that they have not that *mind and spirit* that was in Christ. (Now 'tis not *continuity* but *animation* that makes the several *parts* to become *one Body.*) And as the same soul that acts in the head, acts in every individual member belonging to it: so the same Spirit which was in Christ, is also in all, that as living members belong unto him. But, alas, where is that meekness and gentleness, that love and charity which our blessed Saviour so much expressed himself, so earnestly recommended unto his Disciples; nay, which he made the Test of their really being *his?* Though the *Church of Rome* yet retains the calling of Christ *Lord, Lord*, it is evident in this they do not his will. They still cry, *Hosanna* to him, and yet really *Crucifie* him, at least in his Members. They are not the followers of the humble *JESUS*, but of the proud Pharisees, from whom our Saviour foretels that his Disciples should suffer; but such sufferings as were as little to be declined, as they were hardly to be avoided, being the high-way, though a rough one, to bliss and happiness: *Blessed are ye when men shall hate you.* Joh. 13. 35.

In which words are remarkable,

1. *Suffering foretold*; in which the *Sufferers* also are described, which is the *subjecti* in the Verse, *viz.* such as men shall *hate*, and *separate*, and *reproach*, *&c.*
2. Their *state or condition* declared, or encouragement proposed unto such, (which makes the *Prædicate*) *Blessed are ye*, *&c.*

In the former there are three things considerable.

1. *What it is* that *Christ's Disciples* and followers shall *suffer*; they shall be *hated*, *separated*, *reproached*, and have *their Names cast out.*
2. For *what cause* they shall *suffer* thus; for *the Son of Man's sake.*
3. *From whom* it is that they *suffer*, *from men*, *when men shall hate you*, *&c.*

I shall begin with the latter, as being *first* in the words of the Text, and intend to pass it over with some little reflection at present upon it. *Men* here are not considered *as in honour*, by reason of the *Image of God*, and their conformity unto God; for so they continued not: but men is *terminus diminuens*, a term synonymous with *World*, which our Saviour speaks of elsewhere; denoting such as are put in contra-distinction unto them that are chosen out of the World. It reflects their *fall* and degeneracy upon them. Nay, they whom Christ's Disciples suffer

From whom Christ's Disciples suffer. Homines, i. e. impii inimici doctrinæ meæ, L. Brug. Joh. 15. 18, 19. Joh. 17. 14.

suffer most by, are commonly such as make profession of fearing and serving God too; unto whom light indeed is come, but they love darkness, and so they become bruised with *a double fall:* thus by their choice and practice, being super-added to that of their nature; and whatsoever they pretend to the contrary, (as St. *Jude* speaks of them) they are *twice* dead. There is no enmity like that of Brothers: our Saviour himself suffered from none so much as from his Friend and Disciple *Judas*, and his followers since have endured most in all Ages from such as profess (as well as they do) to be retainers unto him.

But I shall pass this at present without any other Observation, as also the *second part*, or the *state and condition of the sufferers* spoken of in my Text; only you may here of them, though briefly, in the Application.

What it is which the Disciples of Christ suffer.

The two former branches (in my propounded method) of this first part being such as I intend to graft my ensuing Discourse upon, give me leave, though *e postliminio*, to come to a nearer search into them; and at the first view, in the former of them, four remarkable particulars foretold, which the *Disciples of Christ* were to *suffer: viz.*

Hatred.

1. *Hatred.*
2. *Separation* of them, as not worthy of Humane Society, but most unworthy to partake of *Church-Communion.*
3. *Reproach*, upon whom they might vomit up all their Gall without the charge and sin of *bitterness.*
4. The *casting out of their Names*, as such they would scorn to be reckoned amongst in *their service of God.*

1. *Hatred.* This is the *root*, the bitter root of the following bitter fruits: there would be no separating, no reproaching them, no casting out of their names, were it not for the hatred they bear unto them. Now *Hatred* is a displicency at, and aversion from things or persons as evil; and nothing doth make men seem more *hating* and *hateful* to one another, as when they act by a *contrary principle:* for so far at least as they have such a principle in them, they judge not, they affect not any thing alike, but what one calls good, the other calls evil; and what this counts evil, the former esteems as good.

And this must needs be acknowledged to be true in the case of the Text. Christ's Disciples and the Pharisees, his Church and their Persecutors, are acted by a contrary principle; in the one is the seed of the Woman, in the other the seed of the Serpent; and where these meet, though in the same (*Rebecca's*) Womb, they will strive and struggle against one another. Gen. 3. 15.

Our Saviour assigns this as the true reason why the World hated him, and should hate his Disciples after him, *Joh.* 17. 14. because neither he, nor they were of the World.

Now

Now this Hatred, though its ſeat be inward, and it be many times hidden; yet its effects are outward and obvious, none of all the paſſions being more active than love and hatred are; and therefore our Saviour no ſooner had ſpoken of the Phariſees hating of his Diſciples, but he preſently adds, they will *ſeparate you*, and *reproach you*.

Becauſe I intend not ſo much to inſiſt upon them, I ſhall ſpeak but a word of the *Reproaches* which Chriſt's followers muſt bear from the *men* in my Text. *Hatred* being in their *heart*, 'tis no wonder that reviling is in their *lips*; for *out of the abundance of the heart the mouth ſpeaketh*; and ſomething they muſt ſay to juſtifie the perſecutions and miſchiefs they heap upon others: for there are none (who have not put off all humanity) but would willingly have Reaſon and Equity on their ſide. 2. *Reproaches.*

Thus they taxed our *Saviour* himſelf that he was a *Wine-bibber*, *a Friend of Publicans and Sinners*; nay, they would not Crucifie him till they had charged him with blaſphemy. Thus they calumniated the Apoſtles for being *filled with new Wine*, for *turning the World upſide down*, and for deſtroying the Law, *&c.* Luke 7 34. Mark 14.64. Acts 2. 13.

Neither was it better in the immediately ſucceeding Ages: What did not the *Pagan-World* reproach and upbraid the Primitive Chriſtians with? What ſecret and abominable wickedneſs did they not charge upon their private meeting together to ſerve God? No Epidemical Diſeaſe, or Publick Calamity befel the Empire, or any Nation in it, but it was attributed preſently to ſome (forged) wickedneſs of the Chriſtians. And it had been well if they had ſuffered from Pagans only: but, alas, they ſuffered no leſs from Brethren, (if I may call them Brethren) ſo that a Heathen could obſerve, That *no Beaſts were ſo cruel one to another as Chriſtians were.* Hunnianus Marcellinus.

But in this laſt Age of the World we have the dregs of all, and the Papiſts act over again upon the Proteſtants all the Outrages which were ever heaped upon any in the forementioned inſtances: their calumnies againſt their Doctrine, their revilings of their Worſhip, their reproaches of their Perſons, not only living, but even dead too, I could fill Volumes withal: *What ſhall be given unto thee, or what ſhall be done unto thee, O thou falſe tongue?* Pſal. 120. 3.

But becauſe they proceed further, ſo muſt I: They do not only ſhoot out their ſharp arrows, but diſcharge their murdering-pieces at us; nay, their malice is not confined to, or ſatisfied with the ruine of the body, but as if it were too mean a ſacrifice to their fury, they do what in them lies, (and according to their own principle they effect it) to deſtroy the *ſoul* too; for they *ſhall ſeparate you*, and *caſt out your Names*.

Which brings me to ſpeak to the *other fruits* the Text mentions of the *hatred* born to *Chriſt's Diſciples* and followers, and which this Diſcourſe mainly intends; They ſhall *ſeparate you from their company*. Theſe latter words are added by the *Tranſlators* to compleat (as they thought) 3. *Separation.*

thought) the sense; but it being as clear without them, I shall no farther take notice of them.

Some make the *Separation* here spoken of, to be meant only of a *Political or Civil Separation*, and their Gloss is, *In carcerem aut exilium truserint*, they shall *banish you*, or *cast you into prison*; as if the imprisoning or banishing of them, or at least declining to trade or converse with them, were all that was intended here. Lucas Brug. in locum.

This must be acknowledged an evil and a mischief, which they that *obey the Commandments of God*, and hold the *Faith of Jesus*, have met with, and which was foreseen by St. *John*, *Rev.* 13. 16. that *they who would not receive the mark or name of the Beast, should not buy nor sell.*

But the word here used ἀφορίσωσιν, *they shall separate*, hath a further import, and implies a *Separation from their Synagogues*, and Publick Worship, and is the same with ἀποσυναγώγους ποιήσωσιν, they shall *cast you out of their Synagogues*, mentioned by St. *John*: which I the rather incline to think to be the meaning of this place, because also in the *antient Canons* the same word ἀφορίζω is so often repeated to this purpose, *i. e.* when they would by their Censure suspend any from Church-Communion; and then they who were thus censured, were afterwards called *abstenti*, denoting their being held off from Church-Fellowship, and the Censure its self came at length to be called, *The lesser Excommunication.* Beza in locum Joh. 16. 2.

4. *Casting out of their Names.* But our *Evangelist* seems to explain this best by what he adds, *They shall cast out your Names*; as 'tis said of the *blind man* who so constantly profest Christ, that they *cast him out*, Joh. 9. 34. And 'tis to be observed, that ἐκβάλωσι, or *they shall cast out*, here in the *Prediction*, is ἐξέβαλον there, or *they did cast him out* in the fulfilling of it, the same word being made use of by either Evangelist.

As for *casting out their Names*, it refers to a known custom amongst the Jews, of keeping an exact account of all the Names of those who descended from them; not only their *Tribes* and *Families*, but every *individual person* was enrolled, as by evident places in Scripture could be readily made to appear. Now to have *their Names cast out*, or cut off from this Catalogue, was to be accounted no longer for Jews, or amongst the *then* People or Church of God, but to be reputed thenceforth as *uncircumcised*, or as one of the *Gentiles*, that is, out off the Pale of the Church, and out of the Bond of the Covenant with God. We might illustrate this from a custom which they had amongst the *Romans* too; when any were for their misdemeanours to be Disfranchized, the Censor expunged, blotted out, or cut off their Names out of the City-Rolls, and they might not after that enjoy their City-Priviledges, neither were they thenceforth to be accounted as Citizens.

The sum that this amounts unto, is, That they who would embrace, and hold fast the Faith delivered by our Saviour, should be so far from meeting with that love and respect which they ought to be entertained withal, that they should on the contrary be *Separated* and *Excommunicated*,

communicated, put out and accursed, and that by them who shall take upon them to be the Governours of the Church.

That this was fulfilled in the first breaking forth of the Gospel, and in the very dawning of that day, we have evident testimony in Scripture to prove it by; but having in part formerly mentioned it, I shall now only refer you to it.

This was certainly a very great Engine, by which men were not only kept off from attending unto the means of their Conversion, and caused to shut their eyes against the light that did shine so powerfully round about them: but in case it had broken in at any time unawares upon them, it was a most cogent Argument to keep them from owning and cherishing of it: for as St. *John* observes, though *many believed on him*, yet *because of the Pharisees*, (who swayed most in their Sanhedrim) they *did not confess* him, lest they should be put out of their Church; and for this very reason, if *Nicodemus* will come to Jesus, it shall be only *by night*. Joh. 12. 42.

Now it is a known Rule, that *Scriptura Prophetica sæpius impletur*, one and the same Prophecy may respect divers Ages, and be fulfilled in divers times; the same Prediction being frequently mentioned in Scripture with an ἵνα πληρωθῇ, that *it might be fulfilled* upon divers occasions: but I must not now divert to instances.

'Tis evident that this Prediction intimated here in my Text, is no more to be restrained to the Apostles themselves, or the Church at that time, or immediately after, than any other foretelling of suffering persecution in this World is to be, or than any promise of assistance and deliverance whatsoever.

It hath been realized indeed with a witness in our, and in our forefathers days. The *Church of Rome*, who pretend to be the only Church of God, and Spouse of Christ, hath *separated us from them*, and hath *cast out our Names*; so that this day these words are fulfilled, *They shall separate you, they shall cast out your Names.*

But by reason that as it is not the *punishment*, but the *cause* which makes a Martyr; so it is not the suffering barely of these things which speaks any to be the true Disciples of Christ. Let us therefore enquire into the causes assigned by our Saviour in my Text for which his Disciples shall be thus dealt with. And here we meet, *The cause of the suffering of Christ's Disciples.*

First, with a pretended cause, They shall cast out your Names *as evil*, they shall fasten (as much as in them lay) all manner of calumnies upon you; and report of you, not as indeed you are, but as they who hate you would have you thought to be: they will pretend that their separating of you, and not conversing, especially in the Worship of God with you, is not what they would willingly have done, but what they were necessitated unto by you, who (as they alledge) have broached *new Doctrines*, and withal receded from *ancient Customs*, &c. 1. *The pretended cause.*

That this is true in either instance, is too apparent; the Pharisees

charged the Apostles, and the Church of *Rome* do charge the Protestants, with whatsoever they think likely to make them odious.

Some of them doubtless do this out of a kind of integrity of their hearts, separating, excommunicating, nay killing of them, as a deserved punishment for the *evil* they conceive in them, or to have been committed by them: this proceeds out of that blindness and ignorance which is so common unto all in the things of God; but especially as it is further contracted or encreased by them, or inflicted by God upon them, for their not embracing *truth in the love of it*, or *holding it in unrighteousness:* These may be thought indeed to have *believed* lyes, and that they were perswaded that they did God good service in thus despitefully using those that did worship him in spirit and in truth, as is intimated in a parallel place, *Joh.* 16. 2.

Rom. 1. 18, 24.

But as to others, the supposed evil in the matter that *Christ*'s followers are charged with, is but a *pretended* cause of their being so evilly dealt withal; not only as we shall see hereafter, in that they did not deserve it, but because also that they who so severely inflict these Censures, are (at least many of them) not so zealous against *any opinion*, or *practice whatsoever* as 'tis evil, that is, as it is against the manifest truth, or revealed will of God, or as it is dishonourable to God, or destructive to the souls of men: for if they did set themselves against any thing as *evil* indeed, they would set themselves to oppose all evil; and in that *proportion* too in which it is evil, *a quatenus ad omne, &c.* He does not truly hate one sin, who does not hate all sins: as he hath no aversion from one Toad or Viper, as a Toad or Viper, who can take another up into his hands or bosom. Hatred is (as the *Philosopher* says) περὶ τὸ γένος, *against all of a kind*, or against none of that kind. So that I cannot think that the *Pharisees* who were so notoriously guilty of Rapine and Extortion, and could swallow Widows houses, should strain at the imagined fallity of the Apostles Doctrine, or the surmised corruption in the Gospel-Worship; there being especially such fair footsteps for either in those very Writings which they acknowledged the Rule of both. Neither can I believe that the *Church of Rome*, who can license, without any regret or scruple, Stews and Whore-houses, and can dispense with Rebellion and Incest, and what not? that these should be the men who are truly *zealous for the Truths and Worship of God, as such*, or that they should set themselves so much against the Doctrine which the *Protestants* profess, or against the way of worshipping of God which they use, because they are false or impious, for then they would be against all impiety, especially amongst themselves. But the true cause of the aversion of the generality of them from our opinions and practices, is, because they agree not with their *Interests and Lusts*, and are not consistent with their Profit and Grandeur: or, if you will, our *Saviour* here assigns the real cause, *viz. It is for the Son of man's sake.*

Matth. 23. 14.

The

This is that which is at the bottom of all, *'tis for Christ's sake*, for their *respect unto him and his Institutions*, his Truths and Ordinances, that his *Disciples* suffer. Would they not so much consider what he hath enjoined and commanded, but follow their pretended Guides with blind obedience, they should be as when *the strong man armed kept the house*, all in peace. 2. *The real cause for which they suffer.*

In a matter so obvious I will not enlarge to discourse concerning this description of our *blessed Saviour* here used, *Son of man*; 'tis known to be one of the Names or Titles which he was pleased to denote or describe himself by; who, though he was *God blessed for ever*, vouchsafed to take upon him our nature, and to become man for us: thus condescending to us both in the *name and thing*, that we might know that it was he in whom that Prophecy was fulfilled, *Unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given*, &c. And by this means he did in the highest manner recommend himself, and *Truths*, his *Will and Worship unto us*. It is *for his sake*, i. e. for their *love and faithfulness*, their respect and obedience unto him, that they who believe truly in him in all Ages do suffer. Would but the *Apostles* have forborn to *preach in his Name*; would they have observed the antient, but antiquated Rites of the *Jewish Church*, they might long enough have kept in amongst them, and should not have been persecuted by them: So would the *Protestants* not regard the mind and will of God, nor the Doctrine and Institutions of Christ, but let the *Church of Rome* add or take away at its pleasure, they should not have been, nor now need they be, *cast out* by them. Esay 9. 6.

This is that which I shall more strictly confine my self unto, though all along I have intended to lay a Foundation with such *Materials* as might suit the intended Structure.

The *Church of Rome* charge the *Protestants* with *Schism*, as rending and dividing themselves from the true Church, which, as they tell us, they themselves only are.

I shall pass by all the other reproaches they lade us with, though very heinous and innumerable; it being a common matter with them (as with the Pagan Persecutors of old) to put the sincere *Professors* of the Truths of God into Beasts Skins, allowing them to have scarce a humane shape, that any who would might the more eagerly bait and worry them to death.

But as for their imputation of *Schism* unto us, we may well aver, that *of all men* they have least reason to charge us with it upon divers accounts, but especially because *they themselves* have put us from them: they have *separated us*, and *cast out our Names*, and to this day these words in my Text are verified concerning us. And is it not hard to be accused for going from them, who put us away, and cast us from them by force? But they serve us as they did the *Waldenses*, whom they plundered, robb'd, and stripped of all they had, and then by way of derision and contempt called them *Pauperes Lugdunenses*, The poor men of *Lyons*,

about which City those famous Professors of the Truth were formerly most numerous.

I suppose that the matter of fact cannot be doubted of, and that none will question whether the *Protestants* have been, or are thus dealt withal by the *Church of Rome*; for I might bring a whole Cloud of Witnesses to prove it. All the *Martyrs* who have suffered any ways under them, are, in their ordinary course of proceedings, *cast out*, and *Excommunicated* by that Church, before they are delivered over to the Civil Magistrate to be condemned and executed; and such as they cannot get into their hands, or where by the favour of Laws, or tenderness of Princes, the *Inquisition* cannot obtain, the *Council of Trent anathematize and curses* howsoever. And the Bull *de Cœna Domini* goes farther, for in that the *Pope* not only Excommunicates all who in the way which they call Heresie, worship the God of their Fathers, but he accurses all them too, who do *any ways favour them*, though *it be but by giving civil respect, or a necessary alms unto them*; so extensive is their Charity. Little reason have we then to expect that which they so much boast of, Good Works from them.

To pass by their exquisite torments, and more than barbarous cruelties exercised upon the bodies of Christians, (whilst they willingly suffer Jews in many places to dwell quietly amongst them) so directly contrary to the so much gloried in Primitive Church, who could not endure those Bishops who perswaded the Emperour to put Hereticks to death: and to be sure vastly differing from the mind and spirit of the meek *JESUS*, who would not at the instance of his Disciples destroy *the truly both Heretical and Schismatical Samaritans* by fire, though otherwise too he was inhumanly treated by them.

There may seem something to be pleaded for their Church-Censures, as if they were but the cutting off gangrenated and dead Members for the better preserving of the rest of the body. And as if they did this too in obedience to that Apostolical Precept of delivering *such unto Satan*, and so putting away *evil from amongst them*. But what is this to their *interdicting* of whole Kingdoms, in which there cannot be supposed fewer *thousands* (and they full out as innocent as any in *Nineveh*) not *knowing their right hand from their left*. By which Interdicts (according to their own Authors) all Divine *Offices* and Service of what kind soever was forbidden throughout the whole interdicted Territory. None might preach or pray, or administer the Sacraments amongst them, whilst the Interdict lasted; the whole Region being by it put out (as they termed it) of the Communion of the Church, and all that died therein, during that space, how long soever, believed by them damn'd for ever. This (not to mention its effects in other places) lasted in *England*, as *Matthew Paris* records, in King *John*'s time, six years and an half, in which space it is thought there died in this Land above six hundred thousand men, women and children: And must all these necessarily eternally perish,

1 Cor. 5. 5, 13.

Emanuel Sa Aphorismis in turbo Interdictum.

perish, because that the King and Pope were at variance with one another? with which matter the poor Commons had little to do, neither could they intermeddle without rebelling against their Sovereign.

And what does the casting out of the *incestuous* person, or the holding of an *obstinate* sinner as an *Heathen or Publican*, make for the secluding so many millions of *Protestants* from their Church, and putting of them by that means (at least as they surmise) into a state of inevitable perdition?

Especially when as the *Protestants* with one consent do believe all things which are written in the Law and in the Prophets, which St. *Paul* thought a sufficient *Apology* for himself, when he *could not receive the Traditions of the Elders:* they believe no less, all that the Apostles and Evangelists have declared; they willingly embrace the three antient Creeds, accounted by the Primitive Church sufficient Tests of approved Christianity: they desire to live in all good Conscience towards God and men; and to give to every one their due in the place into which God hath put them. Acts 24. 14.

Neither can we reasonably be charged with obstinacy, being very desirous to be informed better in any thing in which through mistake as men we might have erred. We pray to God daily that he would enlighten us, and give us to see the *marvellous things in his Word.* We desire to be thankful unto men, who God is pleased at any time to make instrumental for our further information in any of his Truths, or our Duties. Now 'tis *Obstinacy* only which is *the dead flesh of Heresie or Schism*, and makes that *Gangrene* incurable, and the part affected with it to be sawn off, and contentedly parted withal.

But yet for all this we are not *Scepticks* neither; we know whom and what we believe; and we resolve, by the Grace of God, to continue in it: and if they call our *Constancy*, *Obstinacy*, may they call it so still, rather than that we should depart from it. We should be loath to pin our Faith upon any mans sleeve, be he Pope, or who he will. If St. *Paul* himself, or an *Angel from Heaven preach any other Gospel unto us, than that which we have received, he is, and must be accursed*; a sufficient caveat, one would think, against swallowing at all adventures whatsoever may be recommended to us upon the bare Topick of Authority, and not enquiring into the merit of the cause, the nature of the thing propounded, whether right or wrong, true or false. Henceforth an *Ipse Dixit*, such an one said so, or such *a Pope defin'd* it thus, will be but a pitiful excuse at the Day of Judgment for any false way. I must forbear touching more upon this string at present, being willing to join *Issue about our being parted from the Church of* Rome, from the cause assigned in my Text, *viz. The Son of Man's sake.* Gal. 1. 8.

Which words I shall consider with a more particular relation to the several matters in Controversie betwixt us and them; and it may be reasonably hoped, that if we have *Christ*'s Cause and Honour on our side

in

in those very things for which they *separate* us, and *cast out our Names*, we may be reckoned still amongst his *Disciples*; and the *Church of Rome* as well as the *Jewish Church*, may justly be reputed amongst the Persecutors here foretold of.

And this we may deduce from the following Scheme.

1. It is for the Truths of Christ; the Doctrine own'd, preach'd, and recommended by him, that they thus deal with us.

2. It is for the Purity of his Worship, because we would serve God according to his own Will, and not according to their Will-worship, that they thus abhor us.

3. It is for his Authorities sake, because we dare not take the Government from off his Shoulders; nor pay that respect to any frail man, which is only due unto him who is God blessed for evermore: or if you will, it is because we dare not worship the Beast, that they serve us thus.

To sum up all in one; it is for the Vindication of Christ in all his Offices, that we endure these Indignities at their hands.

1. *The Protestants are separated for Christ's Truths sake.*

The difference between *us* and the *Church of Rome* is most important in *Matters of Faith*; it is indeed such, and so great, that we willingly acknowledge, as they *separate us* for not being of *their* mind, so we are most willing not only to be parted, but *to part* from them, for their not being of *God's mind*: for *what fellowship can light have with darkness? or what Communion hath Christ with Belial?* 2 Cor. 6. 14, 15.

'Tis true on our part, that we would not for every *mis-perswasion* in the things of Religion, part with any ones Communion: as every man hath a soul of his own, so he cannot but through common frailty, different measures and means of knowledge, have conceits and opinions different from others about almost any subject. And though every truth is worth the embracing, yet betwixt Truths themselves there is as great a difference as there is between Farthings and Guineys; which, though they be both Coins, yet are of a very disproportioned value.

There are by the confession of all some *Fundamental Truths*, and by consequence there must be some *Fundamental Errours*. It is a *Metaphorical Epithite*, taken from Buildings, for as Buildings cannot stand if the Foundation be removed or taken away; so the Church, which is
1 Tim. 3. 15. called the House of God, cannot stand neither if it be removed from those saving Truths, upon which, as upon a Rock, Christ hath founded
Titus 3. 10. it. And therefore the Apostle, who so earnestly blames the judging and condemning one another in lesser matters, yet would have us to reject such an Heretick, (after the first and second admonition) who holds any thing contrary unto these.

Now we cannot be justly charged by the *Church of Rome* with any *positive* Errour that can so much as strike at the Foundation: nay, she believes what we believe concerning *God*; *one in Essence, three in Persons*: She acknowledges with us the *Person*, *Natures*, *Suffering*, *Resurrection* and

and Ascension of Christ, and all the other *Articles of the Creed.* She charges us only with *Negatives*, because we cannot admit all such Doctrines as she injuriously obtrudes upon us as matter of Faith: this is indeed the Apple of Contention betwixt us; and because we dare not allow and approve of every *Dictate of the Pope*, or *Definition* of the now *Roman Church* as an *Oracle of God*, we stand accursed by them. *Bishop Hall's Peace-maker.*

To point at some few *instances* in stead of many.

Do we believe that the *Scriptures are a Rule for Life and Manners?* so do *they:* but what they give with the one hand, they take away with the other, in that they make *Traditions*, and the *Determinations of their Church*, necessary to be received with the same reverence that Scripture is to be received withal: so that Scripture, which in word they dare not deny to be the *Rule*, in deed they make it nothing less, defaming it what they can, as *short*, *imperfect*, *and obscure*; nay, forbidding the *reading*, *or having of it in a vulgar Tongue*, where they may. Whereas we may well aver, that no *Art or Science* whatsoever was so fully and *plainly taught* by any Book in the whole World, as our *Christian-calling*, and the *true art of living and dying in the Faith of Christ*, *and in the favour of God*, *is taught us in his Word*; the δυσνόητα, or things in it that are hard to be understood, being matters of less import to the welfare of our souls. As for those Truths whereby Life and Immortality is brought to light, there need not so much Glosses and Commentaries to understand them by, as to bring an humble and teachable mind unto them. 1. *Concerning the Scripture.*

We believe that our Saviour *Christ* is the *Mediator betwixt God and man:* they say that they believe the same too; and because Scripture is so express concerning it, they dare not deny but that he is the only Mediator: for the Apostle says as well that there is but one Mediator, as he says that there is but one God, and Jesus, these two indissolvably together. And yet for all this the *Church of Rome* can give away Christ's Mediators place with a nice distinction at one blow, assigning new Advocates unto us, as often as they please to canonize any. And lest it should be too much for our blessed Saviour to be our Mediator by his Redemption, (which for good manners in the known distinction they leave unto him) they have set up another *Propitiatory Sacrifice* besides that at his Passion, which their *Priests do offer every day for the living and for the dead:* Nay, they will not let *his Blood purifie us from our sins*, but have found out a Purgatory, in which our souls must be purged by their own sufferings after death. 2. *Concerning the Mediatorship of Christ.* 1 Tim. 2. 5: Revel. 1. 5.

We say with the Apostle, that we are *saved by Grace*, Ephes. 2. 8. which the Papists will not deny in down-right terms, but they will add something to it, which shall make this *Grace to be no Grace* before that they have done; either interposing the *prævision* of our good works without Grace in the purpose of God before the World began, or some *good disposition* in us, exciting God to bestow his Grace upon us: which Grace 3. *Concerning Grace.*

Grace being well improved by us, meriteth no less than Glory at his hands for us. Whosoever lists to search this to the quick, will find, that there was never a prouder Opinion held by any of the children of men than this is; hence flow not their *satisfactory works* only, by which they pay sufficiently unto God whatsoever is owing unto his Justice by them; but they hold also works of *Supererogation*, whereby they deserve more than they need for themselves, or know well what to do with, and therefore they put it into the Treasury of the Church, for the avail of those who by *Money and Masses* can take it out. The *Pharisee* was modest who said in the heighth of his boasting, *Lord, I thank thee:* if any of them would speak this opinion out, he would say, *Lord, thou mayst thank me.*

Luke 18. 11.

I will pass by multitudes of instances of the like nature, and will content my self only with these, as being such as I judged most material; and such, as respect the very *Foundation*; and therefore their Errours concerning them must of necessity be of very bad consequence. For,

These truths are fundamental.

1. *Scripture is the Foundation of the Doctrine of Salvation*, and the Church is said in this respect to be built upon the *Foundation* of the Prophets and Apostles, *Ephes.* 2. 20. that is, the Church is built upon the *Doctrine* which was delivered by the Apostles and Prophets; a good Parallel to understand that so much controverted saying of our Savicur by, *Upon this Rock I will build my Church*, to be meant of Christ's building his Church upon the Doctrine, and not upon the Person or Successors of St. *Peter.*

Matth. 16. 18.

2. *Our Saviour Christ is the Foundation of our Salvation its self*, in that he purchased it by his death, and prepares and preserves it by his life; in which respect the Apostle tells us, that none can lay any other *Foundation than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ*, 1 Corinth. 3. 11.

3. Grace is the *Foundation of the Application of this Salvation*, in that all the benefits which *Christ* hath purchased for us, and all the works which answerably thereunto he works by his Spirit within us, are all *founded upon Grace*, upon which only they depend, the hearts of believers being hence said to be *established by Grace*, Heb. 13. 9.

Now if they undermine or take away these *Foundation-Truths* from us, let them take all: 'tis howsoever observable that the *Protestants* Opinions in these cases must needs be *safe:* for surely neither the *Word of God, nor the Son of God, nor the Grace of God*, can be reasonably challenged with any *insufficiency*, that they should need the Additions and Inventions of men to make them successful, in that especially which they are chosen, and appointed unto by God. If God thought his Word to be sufficient to enlighten us, his Son to redeem and intercede for us, his Grace sufficient to sanctifie and keep us unto Salvation, we are content with his choice and allotment, and do not envy others who pretend to have

have more: but it is to be feared that they who grasp at more, do lose all. And we would rather have our Names cast out by them, for not adding to the Word of God, than that for our additions unto it, *God should add unto us the plagues that are written in it.* Rev. 22. 19.

Neither may we be so much taken with the *Truths* which in these and other particulars the *Church of Rome* do retain, as that for their sake we should swallow the Errours which they mix with those Verities; and that rather than to be *separated from their Communion*, we might subscribe or assent to all the other Articles that are proposed by them; that were *to do evil that good might come of it.* Besides, this retaining of some Truths, do stand them in good stead to put off many Errours the better by. Few could vend defective Wares, if they did not shew some that were true made together with them. We know that false or counterfeit Money will hardly go off alone; neither is Poyson ordinarily taken singly, or by its self, but mixed with wholsom Food; and by that means it deceives the sooner, and spreads the farther.

Were there then nothing but this, that we must believe all that is determined, or that shall be determined by the *Church of Rome*, (for they have lately made, and may still make new Articles of Faith) or else we must be accursed by them; we are rather to undergo all their *Separations* and *Excommunications*, than to assent to untruths, or seem to believe lyes. Whosoever they be that propose any thing to be believed by us, we may justly expect that they should prove one of these two things unto us. Either

Two things necessary to be proved before we can believe ought that is proposed.

1. That *the Article proposed by them to be believed is part of the Faith once delivered unto the Saints:* Or

2. That *there may be now a new Faith.*

The former of these, as to the points in controversie, they will never be able to prove; and that makes them speak so slightly of Scripture, because they know it is not for their turn: besides, if that we must *contend* for the Faith that was then delivered, we must contend against the Traditions, and all the super-added Definitions of their Church, so far at least as they are contrary unto it, and reduce all again to the old Test of the *Law and the Testimony*; which we would gladly do, but that they dare not abide by, but call out to the Fathers and Councils, though in vain, for help.

1. *That it was once delivered to the Saints.*

As for the latter, *viz. The making of a new Faith.* Whosoever makes a new *Faith*, must make a new *Hope* for us too; and from them that propound another way unto us, we may expect another Heaven for us; for God's Heaven must be attained in God's way. Yet this new Faith was attempted to be made and propounded by some of them; witness the *Evangelium æternum* which the Fryars made, and the Pope favoured. In which new Gospel they affirmed that the *Gospel of Christ* was not the *Gospel of the Kingdom*, and that the *Old* and *New Testament*

2. *Or that we may have a new Faith.*

had lost their force, or should soon lose it: the time they set is now expired above four hundred years since.

But this device not succeeding, they have since been more reserved and cunning: Not down-right and all at once, but indirectly and by degrees endeavouring to bring us to this their purpose; on the one hand decrying Scripture and revealed Truths as much as they can, and on the other hand magnifying as much those things, whose truth and goodness (if they have any) are only derived from *their Churches Recommendation.* One passage of *Cardinal Hosius* must not be forgot, who affirmed, That were it not for the *Churches Authority* interposed in the case, *Scripture* were no better than *Æsops Fables.* *O my soul, come not thou into their secret: and unto their assembly mine honour be not thou united.*

Gen. 49. 6.

2. *We are separated for Christ's instituted worships sake.*

The difference between the Protestant and now *Roman* Church is as considerable about Religious Worship. They *separate us*, and *cast out our Names*, because we desire to keep to the purity and simplicity of Worship, so often commanded by God, and so highly recommended by Christ; and they on the other side do add in matters of Divine Worship according to the inventions of their own hearts, and the humours of every fanciful Pope.

Joh. 4. 24.

Now this we are the more careful about, because that they who worship any thing besides the true God, or who worship him any other way than according to his own appointment, are in the second Commandment declared by God to be *Haters of him*, *i. e.* in a more eminent manner than any other sinners whosoever. We find also Will-worship to be such a Leaven, as that (where it is join'd with otherwise right and well-directed Devotion) it leavens the whole lump, and makes the whole but one continued provocation in God's account. Those that *swear by the Lord and by Malcham*, are esteemed as if they had not sworn by God at all, but by *Malcham* only. As wicked as *Ahaz* is recorded to be, he is not charged for not retaining the Altar of the Lord, but for bringing another *Altar from Damascus*, and placing of it by God's Altar at the Temple of *Jerusalem.*

Zeph. 3. 5.

2 King. 16. 18.

One would think that *washing of hands*, and the *wearing of broad Phylacteries*, were matters so indifferent, as that they could not be displeasing unto God; especially when *commanded by the Church*, and recommended too by *Tradition:* yet our Saviour assures us (though they thought to please God the better by them) it made all the rest of the Pharisees Worship but vain and unacceptable.

Matth. 15 9.

Worship is indeed the *Marriage-Duty* which the Church of God is to pay unto none but unto him, who is married unto her; and God hath declared himself to be a *Jealous God*, and that he will not permit any Creature to partake that Marriage-rite together with him. Hence it is that Idolatry is so often called Adultery, and a going a whoring from God; and in this, amongst other things, to be sure they agree: that

Jerem. 3. 14.

Ezek. 23. 30.

as

as amongst men for every fault, though heinous ones too, there cannot be a separation between man and wife, but for Adultery there may; so God is pleased not to give a Bill of Divorce to any Church or People for any sin so much as for Idolatry. When once they become over-spread with that sin, then it is that God says unto them, *Lo-ammi, Ye are not my people*, Hos. 1.9.

If we must then either be bidden by the *Church of Rome* to depart from her for not worshipping what she pleases, and as she lists, or that God should depart from us, (by the with-drawing of his Word and Spirit from us) and bid us to depart from him, because we did not worship him according to his prescribed Will, (but preferred man's will before his will) it is easie to determine which we should most dread, and labour to avoid. Nay, let them again and again bid us to depart from them here, that God may not bid us to depart from him hereafter. Their *Censure of Excommunication* is lighter than the small dust in the balance, if compared with his *Sentence of Condemnation.*

I know that this *Harlot*, with the adulterous woman in the *Proverbs*, Chap. 30. 20. *wipeth her mouth, and saith, I have done no wickedness.* Yet I shall take it for granted, that if she gives and requires Religious or Divine Worship to be given to any Creature, she is guilty of Idolatry, or else there is no such thing as Idolatry in the world: this being confessedly the worst kind of false Worship, and that for which God gave the Heathens over unto such *strong delusions, and vile affections*, Rom. 1. 25, 26. Aquin. 2. secundæ quest. 94. Artic. 3.

I shall not insist upon the particulars of Divine Worship; which is either *internal*, the worship of the heart; or *external*, the worship of the body. *Faith and Hope* are the homage which the heart pays unto God. It believes in him, as true and faithful; and hopes in him, as good and gratious in the highest degree. *Adoration and Service* are the tribute which the body owes unto God. Now I could easily evince that the Church of *Rome* gives any, or all of these to Creatures: for whilst they pray to Saints, (whether real or imaginary ones) they must hope and believe in them; for *how can they call upon them in whom they have not believed?* Rom. 10 14. And whilst they prostrate themselves before their very Images, whilst they build *Altars* and *Churches*, and keep *Festivals, or observe days* unto them, they give them whatsoever the outward man is able to perform to God himself.

Yet all this Worship they think that calling of it by another name (δουλεία) they can justifie.

Not to insist upon that which hath been so often proved by others, that the words δουλεία and λατρεία are promiscuously used, and that if there be any difference δουλεία imports the more servile offices of the two. Alas! the common people break the *Cobweb-thred of such nice distinctions*, which they are not able to skill of; and, as some amongst themselves have feared, fall into down-right Idolatry.

Not daring to give Divine Worship,

But λατρεία its self, or that worship which they acknowledge to be Divine, and of the highest kind which can be given to God himself: yet,

1. *To the Cross.* Aquin. p. 3. quest. 25. Art. 4 Bonavent. 3. Sent. dist. 9. q. 4.

1. They give it to the *Cross*, as *Aquinas and Bonaventure* (who are Sainted amongst them) and a many others, do affirm. And *Aquinas* proves that the Cross may be adored with Divine Adoration, because they put the hope of their Salvation in it: and to that purpose he cites an Hymn of that Church, wherein it calls the Cross, Its only hope.

Not to speak of Crosses as they are painted or carved, unto which also they give the same honour: though it is more than probable that as they are usually made, they do not so much as resemble the Cross upon which Christ suffered.

But granting that the true Cross upon which Christ suffered may be worshipped, (which yet we abhor to grant) may they not be mistaken in the Wood of that Cross? It is certain there is more Wood worshipped for the Wood of the Cross, than *Simon of Cyrene* (or their Giant-like *Saint Christopher*) could ever bear. And in such a case when they worship a piece of ordinary Wood, (and perhaps without its due figure to inhance it) themselves must grant that they are Idolaters. But supposing that they be not mistaken, it is a wonder that they should have such a Veneration for the Cross, and Spears, and Nails by which Christ suffered, whilst that all Christians have the other Instruments of his suffering (as *Judas* and *Pilate* are) deservedly in so great an Execration.

2. *To the Host.*

2. They adore the *Host*, that is, *the consecrated bread in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper*, and that with *a Divine Worship*, the very same which they would give to God, or Christ himself. And the *Council of Trent* do accurse all that think this ought not to be done, and that the Sacrament ought not thus to be worshipped. It is strange what they say, that a Priest should make his Maker; but it is stranger yet, that as soon as he is made by him, he should fall down immediately and worship the workmanship of his own hands: which made *Averroes* say, that he never saw so *foolish* a Sect of Religion as the *Christians* were, who with *their teeth devoured the God they had adored.* So that to excuse themselves from being Idolaters, the best plea they do use proves them worse than *Canibals:* for these devour but men like themselves: the Papists, if we believe this their excuse, do *devour the flesh of the Son of God.*

Concil. Trident. Sess. 13. Cap. 5.

Concil. Trident. Sess. 7.

It is not my intention to speak unto that monstrous and truly senceless opinion of *Transubstantiation:* but supposing of it to be true, yet the *Church of Rome*, holding the *intention* of *the Minister to be necessary towards the efficacy of every Sacrament*; (and by consequence that unless the Priest whilst he speaks those five transubstantiating words, *Hoc enim est corpus meum*, do intend by them to change the Bread into the Body

of

of Christ, &c. that then there is no change wrought by them:) what a miserable danger of Idolatry must all the people be in, in the mean while? They certainly cannot tell the mind of the Priest; and if he be not intent, as too often they are not, upon that business, all that worship that *Host* must be most gross Idolaters, were all the opinions of their Leaders granted them to be true.

3. The last *instance* that I will give of their Idolatry, shall be in their worshipping of the *Virgin Mary:* they call this worship which they give unto her ὑπερδουλία, and they make it a middle sort betwixt the other two formerly mentioned: but they might call it, if that they pleased, ὑπερλατρεία; for they say unto her, and attribute unto her more than unto Christ himself. Nay, they *Petition her to command her Son by her Motherly Authority*; little considering that she her self called him *God her Saviour*, though according to the flesh he was her Son. 3. *To the Virgin* Mary. Luke 1.47.

Now though this, and much more which might be said, do very plainly prove that their worship hath got the *Plague-spot of Idolatry* upon it, and therefore that it is by no means to be meddled withal; yet they are so devoted unto it, as that they have commanded all such passages to be left out in the Editions of the Fathers, which speak for Adoration as due, or to be given only unto God. Nay, the very *second Commandment* hath not escaped them, but they have put it out of the number of the Commandments, that they of their Communion might not be self-condemned when they reflect upon it. Index Expurg. Madriti, Anno 1612.

I know that some amongst them do sew other fig-leaves together to hide this their nakedness, but in vain: for how can there be a *subaltern, or subordinate Religious Worship*, unless there be a *subordinate* Deity too? There are, and ought to be degrees of Civil Respects, which are given diversly unto men, according to the various degrees of Worth or Authority in the Objects, unto whom they are paid: but the Honour or Worship of God, and whatsoever is due unto him *as God*, can no more be shared by the Creature, than his *infinite Essence and Majesty* from which it flows. Neither will it serve their turn that they say they do not worship his Image with the same mind and affection wherewith they worship himself; no more than if an *Adultéress* should plead that though she prostitutes her body unto others, yet she does it not with the same degree of affection wherewith she embraces her Husband only. *Gregory de Valens* makes the hardest shift of them all to excuse this sin, by saying, that there is a *lawful* as well as an unlawful Idolatry. And acknowledging that they do use the former: we shall take his Confession that they are Idolaters: but neither he, nor any other can ever prove such a contradiction *(in adjecto)* as a lawful Idolatry. Well may they hold Concupiscence to be no sin, who hold any Idolatry to be lawful. Libro 2. de Idol. Cap. 7.

We can meet with no such *Distinctions*, nor ground for them neither in all the Word of God: but this we find there, that there is no *agree-* 2 Cor. 6. 16, 17

ment

ment betwixt the Temple of God and Idols: and that where Idolatry is, we are bidden to depart, and to be separate, whether we might be retained or no. Whatsoever then we do or suffer in this cause, it is for the *Son of Man's sake*; who himself taught us to answer all Objections, and to repel all temptations unto this sin, by alledging, *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve*, Matth. 4. 10. and by his beloved Disciple hath bidden us *to keep our selves from Idols*, 1 *Joh.* 5. *ult.*

3. *It is for Christ's Sovereignty's sake that we are separated.*

It is for Christ's *Authority and Sovereignty's sake* that we are *separated*, and *have our Names cast out* by the Church of *Rome*. Would we but magnifie their usurped power, we might swear, curse and blaspheme, commit Whordom and Incest, and what not? and yet be accounted true Sons of their Church. Had St. *Paul* but cryed up their great *Diana*, the *Ephesians* had not been offended with him; had he been otherwise as vicious as he was virtuous, or as prophane as he was holy.

We are willing for to obey them that *have the rule over us in the Lord:* but still so as that we may keep and maintain our fealty intire unto him who is over all. We are ready to submit to Governours *under him* in Church and State: but we must remember that we and they too are *under him.* The Legislative and Soverign Power is incommunicably in Christ, and cannot be parted withal by him. Who should give Laws to bind our inward man, but he that can *search and try it*, and can take cognizance of the performance or breach of his Law by it, and can punish or reward as he finds cause?

Neither does the *Infallibility* which the *Church of Rome* assumes, less derogate from the honour which is due unto Christ, it being a *Jewel of his Crown.* I shall not enquire where the now *Roman Church* do make the *subject* of this Infallibility, (for they are not agreed upon it amongst themselves) whether it recides in the Pope, or in a General Council; or if the Pope be infallible, whether he be so in matters of Faith, or in matters of Right only. We deny either, to one or to all of them.

Fallibility cannot be removed out of the mind, no more than Mortality from the body of any. They go *æquis passibus*, and are both fixed to that state which all men are born in, and they cannot put either of them off, no more than Humanity it self. Nay, could there be an *Universal*, or truly *Oecumenical Council*, which there never was since the Apostles times; yet every Member of that Council being but fallible, the Council it self could not be infallible. Not to mention any particulars, which might be instanced in, which though determined by Councils and Popes, yet are antiquated, and rejected by the Papists themselves.

'Tis obvious that *one Pope* hath frequently contradicted another, and one Council hath thwarted the other; and surely they were not on both sides in the right. How much safer is it to obey *God's beloved Son*, who being the expres Image of the Father, is *Truth it self*, and whom we are bidden for to hear? it being the Character of a true Sheep of Christ's

Chriſt's Fold that he will hear his voice, and not the voice of ſtrangers. Joh. 10. 3, 5.

In obedience then *unto Chriſt* it is that we dare not thus become *ſervants unto men.* Though we may *go and come*, we may not believe and diſ-believe as they pleaſe: Nay, we cannot do it if that we would: For the *Will* hath no ſuch power over the *Underſtanding*, as to make it think or believe what it liſts to be true or falſe. The Will can ſet the Underſtanding upon acting on what Object it pleaſes, but it cannot make the Underſtanding concerning any Object think what it pleaſeth, its power over it being only *quoad exercitium*, and not *quoad ſpecificationem.*

Now this makes the Government of the *Romiſh Church* to be the moſt inſupportable tyranny that the World hath ever known. Other Tyrants have been content with their Domination over their Vaſſals Bodies and Eſtates: nothing will ſatisfie theſe but to domineer over the *Souls of men* too; and we meet with the *ſouls of men reckoned amongſt their Merchandize*, Rev. 18. 13. And well may they ſo be: for the greateſt Traffick amongſt them is for mens Souls.

And whereas God declares that he gives us *his Commandments for our good always*, though he hath an indiſputable and uncontroulable right over us, yet he commands us nothing barely that he might exerciſe his Domination and abſolute power that belongs unto him: but all his Inſtitutions and appointments are ſuch, as in their own nature would be advantageous to us, were they not enjoined by him; there being nothing that accompliſhes and perfects man more than Holineſs and the Image of God; which his Injunctions (in every inſtance) do tend only to promote. Deut. 6. 24.

But alas! what are men the better for multitudes of Obſervations injoined amongſt the *Romaniſts?* They themſelves cannot ſay that there is any goodneſs in them, but only what they derive from the *Authority that enjoins them:* And if that Authority ſhould forbid them, or command other things contrary unto, or at leaſt divers from them, they would then be reputed of *another* nature by ſuch who contend ſo eagerly for them: though we have reaſon to believe that they *call good, evil, and evil, good*; yet that they can *make* evil to be good, or good to be evil, is incredible unto us.

Yet theſe pitiful little things, which they can make for good or bad at their pleaſure, they are more earneſt in, than for all the great things in the Law. Tranſgreſſions againſt the Law of God written in our very hearts and natures, and tranſcribed thence into our *Bibles*, meet with little or no cenſure amongſt them: but to doubt of any of their *Churches Definitions*, or to diſobey any of her Commands, (in thoſe things which never came into God's heart to enjoin) is amongſt them a moſt unpardonable ſin. So that as men have been obſerved to love their Books (being the Iſſue of their Brain and Studies) more than their Children,

Children, the fruit of their Bodies: these men dote upon their own inventions and imaginations, more than upon any thing, though by God himself recommended unto them.

1 Cor.9.22. And as it ordinarily happens, the misery of the people is attended by the *iniquity of their Leaders:* for is this to become *all things unto all men*, to make their Flock become whatsoever they please unto them? Is this 2 Cor.10.8. to exercise their power (according to their Commission) *for Edification?* Does it not *impeach the Wisdom of God*, and the Faithfulness of Christ, to make more things necessary to be believed and practised than were commanded us in the Word, or told unto us by the Son of God? Is it not *against the Rule of Charity*, (that Bond of Perfection) to lay such heavy yoaks upon others, as they would not have, were they Dissenters, imposed upon themselves? Does it not occasion *Dissimulation and Hypocrisie* in men (and there is sin enough every where) to require of those in Communion with them, to affirm or deny, to practise or forbear in the things of God, every thing according to the humour of their present Rulers, and especially upon such severe penalties? Formerly whosoever confess'd *with their mouth the Lord Jesus, and believed in their hearts that God had raised him from the dead, might be saved:* And though this was somewhat enlarged in the *Creed*, (commonly called the *Apostles Creed*) what is that to so many Volumes of Decrees and Councils (the late ones especially of their own contriving) which the Church of *Rome* enforces a submission unto?

Rom. 10.9.

2 Cor.11.28. Gal.2.7,8. St. *Paul*, who had *the care of all the Churches upon him*, especially he had *the Gospel of the Uncircumcision committed unto him*, (so that it is a wonder the Popes have not claimed to be his Successors, it is more for their purpose than to be St. *Peter*'s, whose line was amongst them of the Circumcision) this blessed *Paul* having undoubted Apostolick Authority, would not prescribe to the Church of *Rome*, whether all *should observe a day or no*, or whether they should *all eat flesh or no*, though no pretensions of *Uniformity* would be wanting on the one side or on the other. Nay, he was so far from opposing any unnecessary burden, that he commands his *Galatians* to *stand fast in their liberty*. Were there more of his spirit in the world, we might have less shew, but more substance in Religion.

Rom.14.3.

Gal.5.1.

It is a *sorry comfort that is left us*, that notwithstanding the Churches Commands, we may think the things commanded us as indifferent *in themselves* as we will, provided we do but observe them on the account of their *Churches Injunction*. For whilst we are pinched, and perplexed with fears of the unlawfulness of their *Additions*, we are apt the more to suspect that Church to be but a *Step-mother* unto us, who will cast us out of her care and family for such things, which she, thinking to be indifferent, might without prejudice relax her Commands concerning them: but we, thinking that our *Father* hath determined or commanded otherwise, cannot yield her our Obedience in them. Is not this,

this, as much as lies in that Church, *to destroy them for whom Christ died?* and to be sure it is far from endeavouring (which yet is her duty) by all means to save some.

It is our *unspeakable comfort* in the mean while, that he whom we serve, and who is our *Prince and Saviour*, hath a *Goodness towards* us, answerable to his *Power over* us: the one without the other would but speak us as miserable as now we may be happy. *Christ* in all his Commands did not consider only the τὸ θεοπρεπὲς, but the τὸ ἀνθρώπινον, he did not enjoin us all, which *as God* he might have done; but he commanded us such things only which we, *as men*, could bear, and might be benefited by.

As for the power which the Pope assumes unto himself, to *dispense with the Laws of God*; it is far above whatsoever our blessed Redeemer assumed, who profess'd that *he came not to destroy the Law, but to fulfil it.* But thus the Pope fulfils what was prophesied concerning him, that he *should oppose and exalt himself above all that is called God.* Mat. 5. 17. 2 Thes. 2. 4.

Yet this opinion of the *Popes or Churches Authority*, (though somewhat diversified) is such a *darling* opinion amongst them, that could we believe and practise all that their Church propounds, or commands at present, unless we will become ἀνθαίρετοι δοῦλοι, such voluntary Slaves as to let our ears be bored, and henceforth never to question their dictates, nor disobey their future Commands, it would not avail us towards any Communion with them: for (saith *Bellarmine*) whosoever *will not be fed by* Peter, that is, *learn of him and his Successors (the Popes) as Judges and Determiners what he is to take for matter of Faith, and what is the sense of the Scripture, is none of Christ's Sheep.* And the very *Form* of their Church (which makes it Antichristian as much as any thing) consists in this manner of Government. This is the *Center* of Unity: from the Pope as ordinary Pastor of the Universal Church, as from the Head, all life and motion is conveighed unto every individual Member. De verbo Dei, lib. 3. cap. 5. sect. 4.

But suppose this *Authority* or Power to be more diffused, and to be subjected not in the *Pope alone*, but with his *Consistory, or Council*; yet we cannot think that they will ever yield ought unto us, had we truth or right never so much on our side: for whilst they hold their Church to be infallible, and that she cannot decree amiss in any matters of faith, or practice, we can never rationally hope for any redress. For so long as they maintain their Churches Infallibility, they will not alter nor rescind any one thing, (were it to save the whole World) for if they do, their Churches Infallibility is gone for ever; and it *is by that Craft that they have their wealth.*

This then being the case between us, and the Church of *Rome*, that she hath *separated* us, and *cast out our Names*, not for any opinion or practice that she can charge us with contrary to the Word of God, or the Duty of Christians; but rather for keeping *the Commandments of*

Mat. 5.11,12. *God, and the Faith of Jesus.* We may *rejoice and be exceeding glad,* (as we are bidden) that we are thus reviled and persecuted *for the Son of Man's sake:* for not only our *reward shall be great in Heaven,* but here on Earth too. For as our *Saviour* found the blind man after he had been Joh.9.35. cast out for confessing of him, and imparted unto him a more full knowledge concerning himself; so *Christ* hath found the *Protestant Churches,* and afforded them his presence and care, communicating his Light and Love unto them; and nothing is more to be bewailed than that they have not been answerable unto such mercy towards them. We may truly say that God hath turned their curse into a blessing unto us: That *Brutum fulmen* (their Thunderbolt of Excommunication) hath not hurt one hair of our heads, much less hath it *entred into our souls.* For Dr. Hammond *(of Schism.)* as *Thomas de Curselis in the Council of Basil* did well observe, though Christ says, whatsoever *thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in Heaven; he doth not say, Whatsoever thou shalt affirm to be bound, shall be so.* And as the Excommunication of the Jewish *Sanhedrim,* denounced against *Christ's Disciples,* brought them so much nearer unto their Lord and Master, and aliened the Jews themselves, removing them so much farther from the Kingdom of Heaven: so do all unjust Censures unite us to the Apostles, *&c.* by this conformity with, and participation of their sufferings.

How out of the Church there is no Salvation.

As for what the *Church of Rome* doth so frequently triumph in, and thinks to scare us with, *viz. That out of the Church there is no Salvation:* It is to be considered,

1. This *to be true indeed of the Catholick Church.* Taking it not as they do, for all them, and only them that are under the Pastorship of the Pope, but for all *the real and living Members* of Christ: for they only are truly his *Body,* that are enlivened by his *Spirit.* Thus the Apostle joins them together, *Ephes.* 4. 4. *There is one Body, and one Spi-* Rom.8.9. *rit;* and elsewhere he says, that unless the *Spirit of Christ be in you, you are none of his.* As every member of the Body, and only the members of that Body are acted by the same Soul; so is it in the mystical Body of Christ too. And it is the concern of all to obtain *the Spirit of Christ,* and *to live the life of Christ,* without which they cannot obtain *Salvation by Christ,* who is the Saviour only of his *Body.*

2. We acknowledge that it is every ones *duty* to join himself unto, and not causlessly *to depart from a visible Church* that professeth the Faith, and keepeth the Institutions of Christ: Every one ought to en- Cant.1.7. quire where it is *that this great Shepherd feedeth, and maketh his Flock to rest;* and every needless departing from such a Church, does endanger Salvation, in that it makes a man *truly guilty of Schism,* which is a great sin against Charity, so highly recommended unto us: as also in that such an one withdraws himself from those Societies and Meetings Matth.18.20. unto which *Christ* hath promised his presence, and God bestows his blessing.

3. But

3. But where this cannot be obtain'd, or is not sinfully neglected or refused, one may *be saved without being joined to any visible Church whatsoever.* If a Pagan, or a Jew, that is imprisoned in a Country where the Christian Religion is not profes's'd, (being by reading or conference through the goodness of God brought to the knowledge of the truth, and to profess it, living answerably unto it) though he should die before that he could come to enjoy Church-Communion, we have no reason to doubt of his Salvation; our Saviour having told us, *That whosoever believeth in him hath eternal life.* Joh.6.40.

What we think concerning the Church of Rome

But more particularly as to *the Church of Rome:* for so we call them that professing to hold the Christian Faith, are united in subjection and obedience unto that See, and do acknowledge the Pope their Universal Pastor. When we call them a *Church*, we mean no more than that they are a society or company of men, who *make profession* that they are *Christians.* Thus the *Laodiceans are called a Church*, Rev. 3. 14. though they *were wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked*; and we do not read of a sound part amongst them. Thus *God* himself calls the *Ten Tribes his People*, after their defection, by reason of *Circumcision* which they yet retained, and their being the Off-spring of *Jacob.* In this sense soundness of Faith is no more essential to a Church, than health is to a man. And as a *man* that hath the *Plague* or *Leprosie* is still a *man*, though to be shunn'd: so they may be thus a Church, though by all means to be forsaken. But as they themselves take a *Church* for a company of true believers joined together in Communion, so they are no Church, their Faith being far from *the Faith of our Lord Jesus Christ.* Hos.4.6.

Their Succession broken.

As for the *Succession* they so much stand upon, and a *Lawful Ministry* only to be found amongst them. No Church in the Christian World hath ever had so many Interruptions, sufficient to destroy, according to their own principles, the lawfulness of their Ministry. How many *Schisms* hath there been in that Church? one of which alone lasted about fifty years: in which space there was not one person in all their Communion but was *Excommunicated by one Pope or other*, (the right Pope being ever he that had most force or fraud) not to mention the *Simony and Heresie* which some of them were so notoriously guilty of; and any of these are sufficient to break the Chain of Succession amongst them. For I hope that they will not allow an Excommunicated person to have a power of Ordination.

But besides this, they who *are ordained* by any amongst them, not being ordained to the work of a Minister, to preach or feed the Flock of Christ, or to serve him in the holy things of his own Institution, but to *sacrifice the Body of Christ for the living and for the dead*; how can they be *Gospel-Ministers?* This certainly is not a *Gospel-Ministration*, (nor hath so much as a shew of it) but 'tis a repetition rather of the *Jews cruelty.*

But to prevent further Objections and mistakes, we grant,

Two things granted to them. Rom 1.8.

1. That the Church of *Rome was a very famous Church*, whose *Faith was spoken of throughout the whole World.* Thus the seven Churches of *Asia*, at least some of them, were eminent and praise-worthy: but they can challenge no priviledge from what they have been, lest the Jews themselves come in with their pretensions too, (who were once the only Church and people of God.) There is no greater stench than that which comes from a humane Body, when the Soul is once withdrawn: Nor is there any thing more abominable in God's account, than that Church or Society (call it what you will) from whom the Spirit of truth (who formerly did inform and enliven it) is departed.

2. We grant that the *Church of* Rome *had precedence before all other Churches:* but I would not be mistaken; it hath had precedence before them, but for very many Centuries no superiority over them; and this precedence which they had, was only because *Rome* was the *Imperial City*, and Seat of the Empire. And 'tis most like that for this cause the *Epistle to the Romans* was put before all the other Epistles: the place in which that Church was gathered, and the persons probably of which it did consist, being more eminent and conspicuous than others. But when *Constantinople* came to be the Seat of the Emperour, and made, and called *New-Rome*, it contested for that very precedency; and to this purpose it is remarkable that the *Patriarchates and Dioceses* into which the Church-Government was then divided, did answer to the partitions and divisions under the Civil Governours in that Empire: which did make indeed the Ladder for the *Bishop of* Rome *to clime unto this height by.*

What they farther pretend unto.

As for their Pretensions to the *Popes Universal Pastorship*, and Superiority over all Churches, they had need to produce an *Authentick Patent* for it; what they have already shewn, making nothing for their purpose. But I shall wave any farther discourse upon that subject, because it is out of my sphere at present; as also although we should grant the Church of *Rome* all her Pretensions, *&c.* yet upon supposition,

First, *That she is corrupted in her Doctrine and Worship.* And

Which howsoever will not serve her turn.

Secondly, *That she excludes and anathematizes all that do not joyn in those corruptions with her*; (both which particulars have been proved.) We may satisfie our selves in being parted from them, and answer all that they can say with these two Conclusions.

For two reasons.

1. *God never did require of us to join with any person or Church in their sins*; much less that we should *sin* in order to *the obtaining of Salvation at his hands.* God's Rule is, That we should *not do evil that good may come of it.* And were the Communion with their Church never so useful, yet if it cannot be had without sinning, it must not be had at all. If the terms or conditions of Communion with them have any thing of sin in them, they had as good tell us that we should fly in the Air, or count the sands on the Sea-shore, and in case we did not, that then they would not receive us into their Communion; or that being in, they would

would cast us out. For such things as are *morally impossible*, (as an *assent* to any errour, or a *consent* to any false worship must needs be) are as unreasonably required of us, as any thing that is *naturally impossible* could ever be. And if on this account there be a Rent from them, the fault is in them that require such things at our hands; as, being contrary to the mind and will of God, cannot be done by us. We being innocent, nay commendable in the forbearing of them, (as *the innocent person is in the case of a divorce*) must needs be free.

2. *It is sometimes necessary to forsake a visible Church.* Nay more, it may be necessary to *believe and act directly contrary to the Authority of the present Church.* Thus the *Jews* were bound to believe our Saviour for to be the *Messias*, and to hear and obey him in all things, though they were forbidden so to do by the *High Priests and Rulers*, who, we know, determined concerning *Christ* that he was a Seducer and a Blasphemer. Yet what would not the *Church of Rome* give to have so clear and full a Testimony for her definitive Power in all Controversies, as that *Jewish Church* had derived unto it from *God* himself? *Deut.*17.8.9.

But God never *parted with his Sovereignty which he hath over all men:* and where his mind and will is evident, that must be a Law paramount unto us, though it should be never so much gainsaid by any other. All other Superiours are subordinate unto him, who is the only Lord in chief; nay, *King of Kings, and Lord of Lords.* And as those Souldiers Rev. 19 16. do but their duty, who out of a sense of their sworn Allegiance to their Prince, will not join with their Commander in the betraying of a Fort or Town: so if we dare not betray the Truths of God, nor the Souls of men unto the will of any whomsoever, we doubt not but that God does approve of our fidelity unto him, and will say unto us at the last, *Well done, good and faithful servants.*

And thus I have gone through some of those many things which we have to plead for our *separated* condition from the *Church of Rome*, whom we have so long, so undeservedly suffered under. But though they have nothing for us but Execrations and Curses, Fire and Faggot, yet let us return our bitterest Lamentations over them, and heartiest Prayers for them. It is a Lamentation, and shall be for a Lamentation, that so many millions of pretious souls are walking *in paths which lead to the chambers of death.* Oh that we could pluck them as *Brands out of everlasting burnings.* One means only I would caution against, *viz.* Our *becoming theirs in hope to make them ours.* I might observe how God hath blasted all such endeavours, and that they have more strengthened their hands, and weakned ours, than all the Weapons or Arguments that ever were used by them: and above all, God hath expressly commanded us *to come out of her*, and not to *partake of her sins.* But if Rev. 18.4. by our careful and faithful instructing, our meek, charitable, and holy living, we can gain any of them, we shall *hide a multitude of sins*, and James 5. ult. our *labour shall not be in vain in the Lord.*

In

Application. In the mean time if we should suffer still by them for well-doing, the Text affords us Considerations enough to sweeten such a suffering condition unto us.

Three Consolatory Inferences. 1. In that it is but from men: *When men shall hate you.* Now we know there is a *Nil ultra*, an utmost that men can do. 'Tis but to the Body, and it is but in this World.

2. It is for *the Son of Man's sake that we thus suffer*; and if he had required greater matters of us, would we not have done them? I am sure that he hath deserved them at our hands: besides, these *do turn for a Testimony* unto us of the Truth of his Doctrine, whose words we find so exactly fulfilled amongst us unto this day. Not to speak of the 2 Cor. 1. 5. *Consolation which shall abound by Christ in all them in whom the sufferings of Christ do abound.*

3. Christ hath pronounced such sufferers blessed: *Blessed are ye.*

1. 'Tis Christ's *Judgment on our case and condition.* And he, we may truly say then, sees not as man sees. What blessedness in the opinion of men can there be to be *hated, separated, reproached? &c.* But

2. It is not a bare opinion (though his could not be erroneous) that we are blessed, but it is Christ's effective sentence: his *dicere* is *facere.* Christ doth *make them blessed* whom he pronounces to be so; and he can make a blessed Persecution. *If he bless, who can curse?* or if they do, he can turn their Cursings into Blessings. Well may we then con- Psal. 109. 28. clude with the Prayer of the Psalmist, *Lord, let them curse, but bless thou.*

SERM.

SERMON XV.

Invocation of Saints and Angels, unlawful.

Mr Richard Mayo

Rom. 10. 14. *How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed?*

MY business being to shew the sin and folly of the Papists in praying to Angels and Saints departed, I thought this Scripture would be a fit Introduction to it. This Text alone in the learned *Usher*'s opinion (*a*) will put an end to this Controversie amongst those that list not to be contentious. I shall not dilate upon the Context, let it suffice to tell you, that the scope of the Apostle is to prove, that there was a necessity of preaching the Gospel to the Gentiles, as well as the Jews. He had shewed before that there is no difference betwixt them, that the *same Lord over all, is rich unto all that call upon him*, that the *Gentiles calling upon him should be saved by him:* hence therefore he infers, that the Gospel must needs be preacht to them, for as it follows in the Text, *How shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a Preacher?*

(*a*) In answer to a challenge made by a Jesuite in *Ireland*, p. 307.

His way of arguing is such as Logicians call Sorites, Rhetoricians a Gradation, and 'tis very forcible and demonstrative. So also is his manner of speaking, which is by way of Interrogation, which is the more convincing because it carries with it a kind of an appeal to the persons spoken to: the Interrogation here is equivalent to a Negation; *How shall they call upon him*; i.e. they cannot call upon him, 'tis not possible nor practicable; *in whom they have not believed?* the Original is, (*b*) on whom there must be a believing on him as well as in him, whom we invocate; *i. e.* there must be a fiducial trusting and relying upon him. All Supplication is founded on Faith, none implore his favour on whom they have not some reliance; we petition no others here on Earth, we must direct our prayers to no other in Heaven. Whoever is the Object of our prayers, must likewise be the Object of our trust. Now 'tis God alone, (who is distinguisht into Father, Son, and Spirit) in, or on whom we must believe, 'tis to him therefore, and him only that we must

(*b*) Εἰς ὃν οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν.

must pray. He's accurst in Scripture that trusteth in any other, and so is he that religiously worships, or invocates any other but God alone. If Christ himself were a meer man, and not God as well as man, we should sin by believing in him, or by worshipping and calling upon him. 'Tis one Argument whereby we prove the Deity of our blessed Redeemer, that the Scripture doth every where represent him as the Object of Faith and religious Invocation.

This Foundation being laid, I come (without farther prefacing) to raise or build upon it this ensuing Proposition.

The Proposition.

The practice of the Papists in praying to Angels and Saints departed, is very blame-worthy and abominable in the sight of God.

In the handling hereof I shall first shew you that this is the practice of the Papists to pray unto Angels and Saints: secondly, that their so doing is very blame-worthy and abominable in the sight of God.

1. This is the Papists practice. To the end I may not falsly charge or accuse them, I shall in the first place set down the Doctrine of their Church about this matter, and that as it stands recorded in the Council of *Trent*. Thus then that Council hath determined, (c) "That the Saints reigning with Christ, "and offering up their prayers for men, it is "good and profitable humbly to invocate them, "and that we may obtain benefits of God, "through his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, who is "our only Redeemer and Saviour, to have re-"course to their prayers, aid and assistance. 'Tis true, here's nothing decreed about the Invocation of Angels, (though that be also their common practice) but here's a positive Prescription about the Invocation of Saints. 'Tis good and profitable (says the Council) humbly to invocate them, to have recourse to their prayers; who besides their praying for us, are supposed to afford some other aid and assistance to us; and what should that be? why to confer Grace and Glory, and every good thing. That this is intended, will appear, if you consider in the next place those forms of prayer that are in common use amongst them. And here I shall not instance in those pieces of devotion which are muttered in private corners or Closets, but in such as are read or sung in their publick Churches or Assemblies. In the *Breviary*, or *Hours of Sarum*, (which was in great request here in *England* before the Reformation) I find many pretty strains of Devotion; sometimes to all the Quire of Angels in general, sometimes to this and the other Angel in particular; to *Michael*, *Gabriel*, *Raphael*, whom they dignifie with the Title of Archangel. But in

(c) *Sanctis una cum Christo regnantibus, & orationes pro hominibus offerentibus; bonum atque utile est suppliciter eos invocare, & ob beneficia a Deo impetranda, per filium ejus Jesum Christum, qui solus noster Redemptor & Salvator est, ad eorum orationes, opem, auxiliumque confugere.* C. Trid. Sef 9.

Invocandi sunt Sancti eo quod pro solute hominum preces assidue faciunt multaque eorum merito & gratia in nos Deus confert beneficia; Rogati peccatorum veniam nobis impetrant & conciliant nobis Dei gratiam. V. plura in Catechism. ex Decret. Concil. Trident. pontif. jussu edit.

in that and in other *Breviaries*, they are far more liberal of their prayers to the Saints; though they are made a little lower, yet the devotion of the Papists is carried a little higher to them than to the Angels: to these, and to their prayers, aid and assistance, they are more particularly directed, (as you heard) and accordingly they practise. Of these they don't only desire that they would pray for them, (as some of their later Writers, mincing the matter, do pretend) that indeed would be less culpable, though altogether, as we shall see, unwarrantable: but these they formally invocate, and pray unto, and that with the same shew of Devotion which they use to God himself. To these they build Temples, erect Altars, burn Incense, make Vows and Promises, *&c.* *(d)* These they dignifie with the same Names, Titles and Attributes as they do our Saviour himself; and of these they ask the same blessings and favours as they do of God, and which are beyond the power of any meer Creature in Heaven or Earth to give. *(e)* In particular they pray unto them to enlighten their eyes, to increase their virtues, to pacifie their consciences, to pardon their sins, to comfort and save their souls, *&c.* 'Tis a poor plea of *Bellarmine*'s, *(f)* whereby he attempts to defend such prayers, *that though the words themselves may seem to imply more than a meer praying to the Saints to pray for us, yet that's all which they intend.* To this purpose also a later Writer delivereth himself: *'Tis not*, says he, (g) *the dead words, but the invention of the Speaker that animates them, that makes them to be a Prayer.* And again; *'Tis the sense that makes the words to be prayer, and not the bare characters or letters; and that the Churches sense is no other but to desire the Saints to obtain for us the blessings expresst in those forms, is manifest from her frequent intermixing that usual form of* Pray for us, *and from her publick Doctrine as declared in the Council of* Trent, *and inculcated to all the faithful in their Catechisms.* To all which it may be replied, That many use these Prayers who never were instructed concerning any such Interpretations of them. And from whence should men learn the sense of your Prayers, but from the known signification of the words used in them? If their Leaders did mean as some of them speak and write for the better colouring and gilding over this abomination, why don't they all this while reform their *Breviaries*, and Forms of Devotion, and so frame the Petitions or Prayers therein, that they may be a little accommodated to this sense that they would seem to put upon them? *(h)* A learned person speaking to this very case, brings the Papists to this *Dilemma: Those*

(d) *S. Claudi desolatorum consolator, captivorum liberator, resurrectio mortuorum, lumen cæcorum, auditus Surdorum, sanator languidorum, tutor naufragantium, via errantium, salus omnium in te sperantium, &c.* Hor. Sec. us. Rom. 6. die Junii.

(e) *O beati Apostoli Dei solvite me a peccatis, defendite me a pœnis inferni, & de potestate tenebrarum. Confortate me, & ad regnum æternum me perducite. Omnes Sanctæ Virgines Dei, adjuvate me, ut habeam bonam voluntatem cordis, corporis Sanitatem, castitatem, & post cursum vitæ meæ, Societatem perpetuæ beatitudinis.* Ibid.

(f) De Sanct. beat. l. 1. c. 17.

(g) Cath. no Idol. p. 402, 404.

(h) Dr. *Stillingfleet*'s *Idolatry of the Church of* Rome, p. 166.

Thoſe, ſays he, *of the* Roman *Church that uſe theſe forms, and that according to the known ſenſe of the words, either they do well or ill in ſo doing: if they do ill, then their Church is guilty of intolerable negligence in not preventing of it: if they do well, then their Church allows of more than bare praying to Angels and Saints to pray for them.*

It muſt be confeſt the Church of *Rome* hath laid aſide ſome of her old *Breviaries* and Offices, yet becauſe they were formerly allowed and enjoined, ſhe muſt be accountable for them, until ſhe confeſs her errour and miſtake.

Before I paſs this Head, let me ſhew you one thing in their practice that deſerves a particular remark; and that is the *hyperdulia* (as they call it) or the tranſcendent ſervice and worſhip which they beſtow upon the Virgin *Mary*. Her they ſalute and call upon under the terms of the *Queen of Heaven*, the *Gate of Glory*, and *Fountain of Mercy*, and *Mother of all Grace:* She is a *Goddeſs*, *Savioureſs*, *Advocateſt*, *Medicatrix*, *Empreſs*, and what not? For her they have many particular Offices, * and to her they direct more prayers than unto God himſelf. To *one Pater Noſter* they are taught to ſay *ten Ave Maries*; which being five times ſaid, makes one *Roſary*, or *Chaplet of Prayers:* and to the end they might not be deceived in their tale, they ſay that St. *Dominick* (it may be one of our Ladies Chaplains) did invent the uſe of *Beads*. Of her their approved and renowned Doctors affirm many incredible things; as (i) that *She being the Mother of the Son of God, who doth produce the Holy Ghoſt, therefore all the Gifts, Virtues and Graces of the Holy Ghoſt, are by her hand adminiſtred to whom ſhe pleaſeth, when ſhe pleaſeth, how ſhe pleaſeth, and as much as ſhe pleaſeth.* They teach that ſhe is (k) *conſtituted over every Creature, and whoſoever doth bow his knee unto Jeſus, doth fall down alſo and ſupplicate his Mother; ſo that the Glory of the Son may be judged not ſo much to be common with the Mother, as to be the ſame.* (l) That *She aſſumes to her ſelf of the Omnipotency of her Son as much as ſhe pleaſeth, and that ſhe comes* (m) *before the Golden Altar of Humane Reconciliation, not interceding only, but commanding, a Miſtreſs, not a Servant.* (n) They tell us, *That the*

* In the Pſalter approved by the Doctors of *Sorbon*, I find this prayer to the Virgin *Mary: My only Succour, my lips are bound to publiſh no other praiſes but thine. By thee the head of the Serpent hath been bruiſed, the world repaired, thy Power is boundleſs. unto thee I confeſs my ſins, into thy hands I commit my ſoul. Come unto* Mary, *ye which have thirſt, pray unto her, that with her water ſhe will waſh away the filthineſs of your ſins*, &c.

(i) *Mater eſt filii Dei qui producit S.S. ideo omnia dona virtutis & gratiæ ipſius S. S. quibus vult, quando vult, quomodo vult, & quantum vult per manum ipſius adminiſtrantur.* Bernardin. Senenſ. Serm. 61. artic. 1. c. 8. (k) *Conſtituta eſt ſuper omnem creaturam, & quicunque Jeſu curvat genu, Matri quoque prono ſupplicat, & filii gloriam cum Matre non tam communem judico quam eandem.* Arnold Carn. tract. de laud. Virgin. (l) *Ipſa Dei Mater de Omnipotentia filii ſui, cui eſt innixa quantum vult ſibi aſſumit.* Buſt. Marial. part. 12. Serm. 2. (m) *Accedit ante aureum humanæ reconciliationis altare, non ſolum regans ſed imperans, Domina non ancilla.* Damian. Serm. 1. de Nativit. B. Mar. (n) *Dedit B. Virg. Rex regum Pater cœleſtis dimidium regni ſui, quod ſignificatum eſt in Heſter regina, &c. Sic Pater cœleſtis cum habeat juſtitiam, & miſerecordiam, tanquam potiora regni ſui bona, juſtitia ſibi retenta miſerecordiam Matri Virgini conceſſit.* Gab. Bret. in Canon. Miſſæ, Lect. 80. *Si quis ſentit ſe gravari a foro juſtitiæ Dei, appellet ad forum miſerecordiæ Matris ejus.* Bernardin. de Buſtis Manal. part. 3. Serm. 3. in Excellent. 4. & Part. 5. Serm. 7. in Excellent. 5.

Hiſtory

Hiſtory of Ahaſuerus *in* Eſther, *was a Figure of God's beſtowing half his Kingdom upon the bleſſed Virgin; that having Juſtice and Mercy, as the chiefeſt Goods of his Kingdom, he retained Juſtice to himſelf, and granted Mercy unto her. Hence if a man find himſelf aggrieved in the Court of God's Juſtice, he may appeal to the Court of Mercy of his Mother, ſhe being that Throne of Grace whereof the Apoſtle ſpeaketh in the* Hebrews, Let us go boldly to the Throne of Grace, that we may receive Mercy, and find Grace to help in a time of need.

In reſpect of her, they ſay, (o) *God after a ſort is more bound to us, than we are to him.* (p) *She in ſome reſpect did greater things to God, than God himſelf did to us and all Mankind.* (q) *She only ſaid, He that is mighty hath done great things to me: but of her we may ſay, She hath done greater things to him that is mighty.* Farther they tell us, (r) *That though ſhe be ſubject to God, in as much as ſhe is a Creature*; yet is ſhe ſaid to *be Superiour, and prefer'd before him, in as much as ſhe is his Mother.* Hence they call upon her *in a Mothers right to command her Son* (ſ). Yea, in our Ladies Pſalter, which is made in imitation of *David*'s Pſalms, the Name of *God* is every where expunged, and the Name of the *Virgin Mary* put in its place. *Our Lord* is changed into *our Lady.* In ſtead of *(In thee O Lord,)* it is, *In thee, O Lady, I put my truſt, let me never be confounded.* In ſtead of *(Let the Lord ariſe,)* it is, *Let our Lady ariſe, and let her Enemies be ſcattered.* In ſtead of *(O come let us ſing unto the Lord,)* it is, *O come let us ſing unto our Lady, and make a joyful noiſe to the Queen of our Salvation.* The very rehearſal of theſe things is enough to make your ears to tingle, and your hair to ſtand an end. Oh how patient is God in bearing with the provocations of the Papacy!

(o) *Propter B. Virg. Deus quodammodo plus obligetur nobis quam nos ſibi.* Bernardin. Senens, Serm. 61. Art. 1. c. 11.

(p) *Plus fecit Deo,* Id. ibid.

(q) *Tu feciſti majora ei qui potens eſt, &c.* in Euſtis Marial. part. 6. Serm. 2.

(r) *Licet ſit ſubjecta Deo in quantum creatura ſuperior tamen illi dicitur in quantum eſt ejus Mater.* Id. par. 12. Serm. 2.

(ſ) *Jure Matris impera dilect ſſ. tuo filio Domino noſtro Jeſu Chriſto.* Bonavent. Cor. B. M. Virg. Tom. 6. Rom. Edit. A. 1588. *Ora patrem, Jube natum, O fœlix puerpera pians ſcelera, Jure Matris impera redemptori. Ora ſuppliciter, præcipe ſublimiter.* Hiſt. ſec. Char. Auguſt. de Commem. B. M. Virg.

2. The ſecond thing to be conſidered is this, that this practice of the Papiſts is very blame-worthy and abominable in the ſight of God. A little reflection upon what hath been already declared, might ſerve for confirmation hereof, and be in ſtead of a thouſand Arguments with all thoſe who have the leaſt Zeal of God's Honour remaining in them. However, *(ex abundanti)* I ſhall attempt the proof of what I have propounded, by ſhewing you, that this practice of the Romaniſts is,

1. Unſcriptural. It hath not any warrant from the Word of God: this is acknowledged by the moſt ingenuous amongſt themſelves. (t) *Banneſius* confeſſeth, that *it is not taught in the holy Scriptures, neiciendos neque expreſſe neque involute S. Literæ docent.* 2. Qu. 1. Artic. 10. Lib. 1. 'Tis Unſcriptural.

(t) *Orationes ad Sanctos ſa-*

ther expreſly nor covertly, that Prayers are to be made to the Saints. Bellarmine tells us, (u) *It was not the manner under the Old Teſtament to ſay, Holy* Abraham, *pray for us*, &c. For which he gives ſeveral reaſons, as, *That the Fathers were then ſhut up in priſon, and did not ſee God*, &c. *Salmeran* ſays the ſame, and withal adds, (w) *That there is nothing expreſt in the Goſpels, or the Epiſtles of the Apoſtles touching this matter. It would have been hard*, ſays he, (x) *to enjoin ſuch a thing on the Jews, and the Gentiles would have thought that many Gods were put upon them inſtead of the many Gods they had forſaken.* And if they had not themſelves confeſt, they might eaſily have been convinced that there are no footſteps at all of this practice in the holy Scripture. In all the Book of God there is not one precept for praying to Saints, nor any example of any one of God's people that ever made ſuch a prayer, nor any promiſe that ſuch a way of praying ſhall be accepted, nor any puniſhment threatned in caſe it be neglected. The Scripture every where makes God to be the only Object of Prayer and Invocation: how many hundred Petitions or Prayers are upon record there, and not one of them put up to any other? When the Lord taught his Diſciples, and us in them to pray, he directs them to ſay, *Our Father which art in Heaven.* The Scripture often expreſſeth this duty by the term of *praying* only, without any mention of the Object: *When you pray, uſe not vain Repetitions: When thou prayeſt, enter into thy Cloſet*, &c. And hereby 'tis intimated, that Prayer in matter of Religion can ſignifie nothing elſe but praying unto God; it is not Prayer if it be directed to any other.

(u) De Beat. Sanctit. c. 19.

(w) In 1 Tim. 2. 2. diſput. 7. 8. Ec. Enchyrid. c 15 Suar. Tom 2. in diſput. Tho. 42. Sect. 1. V. Eccium in Enchyrid. ſuo.

(x) Durum erat id Judæis percipere, & Gentibus daretur occaſio putandi multos ſibi Deos, &c. Salmer. ut ſup.

Chriſtians were required, when infirm, to have recourſe to the prayers of living Saints, and were told the fervent prayers of ſuch were prevalent. Why were they not directed to the Patriarchs and Prophets, to the bleſſed Virgin, to St. Steven *and St.* James, *and other early Martyrs of the Church, whoſe Prayers it ſeems by the Church of* Rome *are highly meritorious, and far more prevailing? This ſhould have been the rather inculcated, becauſe it was novel practice, and never uſed by the* Roman *Church; and therefore they had need of an expreſs to encourage them to ſuch Devotions.* Dr. *Whitby*'s Diſcourſe of the Idolatry of the Church of *Rome*, p. 188.

This being the caſe, the Popiſh practice muſt needs be an abomination. God will allow of nothing in his Service and Worſhip but what he himſelf hath inſtituted. 'Tis a ſaying of Biſhop *Davenant*, (y) *That all the neceſſary parts of Religious Worſhip do ſo depend upon the will of God revealed in his Word, that whatſoever is not founded in his Word, is contrary to his Will.* To this purpoſe alſo is that of St. *Auguſtine*, (z) *Deum ſic colere oportet quomodo ſeipſum colendum eſſe præcipit: We ought ſo to worſhip God as he hath appointed himſelf to be worſhipt.* Hear what the Scripture it ſelf ſays, *Deut.* 12. *ult.* the Iſraelites are dehorted from uſing the religious Rites and Cuſtoms of the Heathens in the worſhipping of God; how then? in what manner muſt they worſhip him? *Whatſoever thing he commands they muſt obſerve to do, they may not add thereto, nor diminiſh from it.* To all which may that of our Saviour be added, *Mat.* 15. 9. *In vain do they worſhip me, teaching for Doctrines the Commandments of men:* i. e. preſſing mens Traditions in the room of Chriſt's Inſtitutions.

(y) *Quæ in verbo non fundentur divinæ voluntati adverſentur.* Dav. Deter. Qu. 44.

(z) De Conſenſ. Evangel.

One

One thing more may be considered under this Head, that the worshipping of Saints and Angels, *(a)* (of which Prayer and Invocation is a principal part) it is not only Unscriptural, but Antiscriptural, as 'tis not commanded, so 'tis forbidden in the Scripture: there 'tis written, *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.* I am not ignorant of the Popish distinction betwixt λατρεία and δουλεία; the former they say belongs only to God, the latter may be applyed to the Creature. But how often have they been told and convinced, that these are used reciprocally both in sacred and prophane Writ? *(b)* and some of themselves have been so ingenuous as to acknowledge it. He that first coin'd this distinction, was no Critick in the Greek Tongue *(c)*, nor did he ever intend it in the Popish sense. He himself confesseth, that both the one and the other belong only to God: *The one is due to him as he is our Lord, the other as he is our God.* Nor when our Saviour uttered those words, was he desired of the Devil to defer that service to him which they call the superiour and highest Worship, nor did he pretend to be God himself, but only to be his Minister, and to enjoy what he offered by the bounty of God, and a little religious prostration would have served his turn. But what says Christ to him? *Get thee behind me, Satan, for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve:* the word *only* is not in the Old Testament Text *(d)*, where it is recorded, but our Saviour puts it in to shew that God, and none but him, is the Object of Religious Worship and Service. Hence 'tis also that an Angel chides the Apostle *John* for offering Religious Service to him: *See thou do it not*, says he, *Rev.* 19:10. and 22.9. *I am thy fellow-servant:* the word is (σύνδουλος,) I am thy fellow *in dulia*, he rejects that kind of Worship which the Papists say belongs to Saints and Angels. And then it follows, *Worship God*; he is the only Object of Religious Worship. Don't worship one that is thy fellow-servant and Worshipper.

(a) *Eximium adorationis genus Bellar. delectos triumph.*

(b) *Quid si & una religionis virtus sit, quæ latriam duliamque continet? certe plurimis atque sapientiss. ea est opinio.* Nic. Serar. in Litan. 2. Qu. 27 V. P. du Moulin de novit. Pap. L 7. c. 13.

(c) *Aug. Ego quid, Græcæ linguæ perparum assecutus sum, & prope nihil.* Cont. Petitian. L. 2. c. 28. Cont. Faust. l. 20. c. 21.

(d) Deut. 6. 13

2. This practice is irrational, 'tis not (λογικὴ λατρεία,) a rational service: there is nothing more absurd; the absurdity of it appears in these two particulars. 'Tis irrational.

1. Consider their incapacity to hear the Prayers that are directed to them. 'Tis own'd on all hands to be ridiculous and irrational to pray to them that cannot hear our prayers. The Text says, *How shall we call on them in whom we don't believe?* and I may add, How shall we call on them who can't hear us? That this is the case of the glorified Spirits, is evident, because, 1. They are not *Omnipresent*, they are circumscrib'd and finite Creatures, and can be but in one place at once. I dare affirm this of the Virgin *Mary* her self: And how then shall she hear the prayers of 100000 persons, who it may be are praying to her at one and the same time, some of them in this Hemisphere, and some in the other? and if she can't hear, I doubt me she can't help those that are so much devoted to her service. 2. They are not *Omni-percipient*,

if

if they should hear what men say with their mouths, they cannot perceive or understand what men say in their hearts. Now the most of our Prayers, *(e)* especially in our private Devotions, are meerly mental, they are *(conceptus animi)* such as are conceived in our hearts and minds; yea, the most acceptable Prayers consist many times in those sighs and groans which are never uttered: To say the Saints and Angels are privy to these, is to deifie them. There's never a meer Creature in Heaven but will confess (as *David* doth in another case) *that such knowledge is too painful and too wonderful for him.* This is an incommunicable property and perfection of God, so *Solomon* affirmeth, 2 *Chron.* 6. 30. *Thou only knowest the hearts of the children of men.*

It is disputed whether the Saints in Heaven have any knowledge at all of humane affairs on Earth: many wise and learned men are of an opinion to the contrary, and so the Scripture it self seems to be *(f)*. This we may affirm with the greatest confidence, that they have no such knowledge as is necessary in this case, they can neither hear nor understand the Prayers that men offer up unto them, nor (which is also requisite) with what mind they offer them, whether in sincerity or in hypocrisie.

The Papists themselves are greatly divided to this day about this matter, and can neither satisfie themselves nor one another, how the glorified Saints come to have notice of our Supplications: *(g)* many nice and curious Questions they have; as, Whether the Souls of those they pray to be present or absent? if they be present, then whether it be really or virtually? if they be absent, and have information from others, then whether it be from the Angels, or from God himself? or if it be from God, then whether it be by particular revelation from him, or by the beatifical Vision of him? Thus these *Babel*-builders are confounded and distracted; they agree (as I hinted before) that the Saints in Heaven must be made acquainted with our Prayers, or else in vain are they invocated: but how they come at it, *non convenit inter omnes*, says *Pinello*, all are not agreed about it. Some of them are much taken with a conceit of a Looking-glass in the face of God, wherein those blessed Spirits have a full view of all things past, present and to come: this is a pretty Notion, and 'tis pity that it hath no more universal reception: but alas, (this *Speculum Trinitatis vel Deitatis*) this Looking-glass in God's face or essence, was broken in pieces long ago, and now some of their own can see nothing in it but the folly and rashness of those that invented it, without any warrant in the Word of God. *Cajetan*, *Gabriel*, *Durandus*, *Scotus*, *Occam*, and a many other great Names, will not be beholding to this Imaginary Glass. Nor will that Text, *In thy light we shall see light*; nor that saying, *(qui videt videntem omnia is videt omnia)* He sees all things that sees him who sees all things, establish the belief of it. If it were so, that he that seeth God, seeth whatever is in God, and whatever God seeth, then the Angels that

(e) *Plerumque hoc negotium plus gemitibus quam sermonibus agitur, plus fletis quam affatu.* Aug. Ep. 121.

(f) Job 14.21. 2 King. 22.20. Eccles. 9.5. Isai. 63. 16. *August. dicit Mortui nesciunt etiam sancti, quid agant vivi, etiam eorum filii.* Ansel. Laud. Gloss. interlin. ear. in loc. prædict. V. Gratian. Gloss. in 13 qu. de Mortuis. Aug. de cura pro mortuis c. 13 Si rebus viventium interessent animæ mortuorum, &c. *If* (says he) *so great and famous Patriarchs as* Abraham *and* Jacob *did not understand how the world went with their posterity, how can it be that the dead should at all take notice of the living, or intermeddle with assisting them?* &c.

(g) *See Doctor* White's *Defence of the true way to the true Church*, p. 105, 106.

that always behold his face, and look up to this Glaſs, would never have ſtoopt down to pry as they did into the myſteries of the Goſpel, and needed not to have been informed by the Church about the manifold Wiſdom of God: then they would not be to ſeek concerning any future events, no nor be ignorant of the day and hour of the laſt Judgment.

2. Conſider what manner of Saints many of them are, whom the Papiſts ſolemnly invocate and pray unto: they are ſuch whoſe Saintſhip, nay whoſe exiſtence is very queſtionable. *Caſſander* (one of their own party) makes this complaint, *(h) That the people do now almoſt deſpiſe the old Saints, and ſerve with more affection the new, whoſe holineſs is leſs certain; yea, there are ſome of them, of whom we may juſtly doubt whether ever they lived in the world.* 1. They call upon ſome of doubtful Saintſhip or Holineſs, who inſtead of reigning in Heaven, are frying it may be in Hell. He muſt be of an eaſie belief, that can be certainly perſwaded that every one whom the Pope Canonizeth, and putteth into the Liſt of Saints, is ſo indeed. The Romaniſts themſelves *(i)* acknowledge that in a *matter of fact his infallible Holineſs may be miſtaken, and that there may be an errour in this very buſineſs of Canonization.* And ſome are ſtrongly of opinion that the Pope was out when he Canonized *Thomas Becket* Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, and commanded the people of *England, annually to celebrate the day of his paſſion, and that by Prayers to him they ſhould endeavour to merit the remiſſion of their ſins.* Now this *Thomas*, for ought that can appear in his Hiſtory, and that as related by their own Writers, *(k)* was a proud *Prelate*, and a Rebel to his Prince: One that had ſet the whole Nation in a flame to defend the Popes quarrel againſt the King, and when he died was rather the Pope's, than God's Martyr, ſeeing he died not for the Faith of Chriſt, but for the Defence of the Popiſh Tyranny and Uſurpation. 'Tis a good diverſion to read his Hiſtory as it's ſet together by Doctor *Patrick* in his Reflections upon the Devotion of the Roman Church, there you may find what a kind of Saint he was, and what Devotions the people by thouſands paid to his Shrine. Yea, the people were ſo devoutly affected to this new Saint, that in reſpect of him, they ſcorned to have but little Conſideration of the bleſſed Virgin, or of Chriſt himſelf: for there being three Altars in the Church of *Canterbury*, one to Chriſt, another to the Virgin *Mary*, and a third to this St. *Thomas*, the Offerings at his Shrine came to about a thouſand pounds, when thoſe to the Virgin *Mary* came not to five pounds, and to Chriſt nothing at all. The people were the more encouraged in their Devotion, becauſe of the lying Legends and fabulous Miracles that were reported to be wrought upon thoſe that did invocate and pray unto him. One pleaſant ſtory may not be omitted, and it is of a little Bird that was taught to ſpeak, and could ſay St. *Thomas*. It happened that this Bird ſitting out of his Cage, was ſeiz'd by a Spar-Hawk, who being ready to devour it, the Bird

(h) *Conſult. de artic. religionis, Cap. de meritis & interceſſ. Sanct.*

(i) *Th. Aquin. Cajetan, Melch. Canus.*

(k) *Nubrigenſ. de reb. Ang. l. 2. c. 16. Baron. Annal. ad An.* 1163.

(l) *Festiv. fol.* 80. *Anton. Hist. Tom.* 2. *p.*707.

Bird cryed *St. Thomas*, *St. Thomas* (l): whereupon the Spar-Hawk fell down dead, and the pretty Bird was saved alive. Now, says a devout Author, (and doubtless his inference is strong and concluding) *if St.* Thomas *of his great Grace heard and helpt this poor Bird, much more will he hear a Christian man or woman that cries to him for help and succour.*

Let me instance but in one more of their Saints, (the Papists will be very angry if they hear I call his Saintship in question) and that is St. *Francis* the Founder of the *Franciscan Order.* He's no ordinary person with them: his Admirers parallel him with Christ, in the Prophesies that were before of him, in his Birth, Life, Temptations, Doctrine, Miracles, and what not? This and a great deal more may be read of him in his Book of Conformities, which was not long since (*m*) published with allowance. Of him, (*n*) one sings, *Qui Franciscus erat nunc tibi Christus erit.*

(m) *An.*1590.
(n) *Turselline.*

Francis *he was won't to be,*
Now he shall be Christ *to thee.*

(o) Bonaventure, *thence as a Motto 'tis placed under his picture.*

Another great person (*o*) swore at *Paris*, it was revealed to him of God, that St. *John* (by the Angel that had the Seal of the living God in the *Revelation*) meant no other than this St. *Francis:* yea, such is their esteem of his Intercession, that they prefer it to Christ's, and say, (*Christus oravit, & Franciscus exoravit*) Christ hath pray'd, *Francis* hath obtain'd.

And yet who so reads the aforesaid Book of his Conformities, and *Bonaventure* of his Life, and other Chronicles and Records of him under the Papists own hands, will soon find that he was a strange kind of Saint, nay, that he did a multitude of things that argued him destitute of common sense. What will you say of a man that shall preach to Birds and Beasts, and salute them kindly with saying, (p) *Brother Bird*, and *Brother Beast?* What if you should see a man taking up the Lice that fall from his Garments, and putting them on again, for fear it may be of wronging or dislodging those poor innocent Creatures? What can be said for cutting his Garments in pieces, and then giving them away? unless it were that he might give to the more. What will you say to his tumbling in the mire? unless it were a significant Ceremony. And to his making Crucifixes of Mortar as Children do Babies of Dirt, with his own hands? Once more, what shall one think of his making a Wife of Snow, and of his embracing her to allay his amorous and lustful heat? These, with many more such ridiculous actions, shew him to be a Bedlam brain-sick Creature; and though by me he shall be no farther censured, yet I see no reason why he should be Sainted, much less why he should be so blasphemously magnified and adored.

(p) *Wadding, An.*1212. *n.*30. 31. *Bonavent. vit Franciscus.*

2. They invocate some that are of dubious existence, as well as holiness.

holineſs. As they have many ſuſpected, ſo they have many feigned or fabulous Saints in the Church of *Rome*. What Chriſt ſaid of the *Samaritans*, may as truly be ſaid of the *Romaniſts*, *They worſhip they know not what, yea they know not who.* Who would imagine this people ſhould be ſo blinded and beſotted as to worſhip and invocate imaginary Saints? In the aforeſaid *Breviary* or Hours of *Sarum*, (q) I find St. *Chriſtopher* prayed unto whom they ſuppoſe to have been a Giant of a prodigious ſtature; *Mantuan* ſays (r) he was many Ells high. *Ludovicus Vives* ſays, he ſaw a Tooth of his bigger than his Fiſt. Of him it is reported that he carried Chriſt over (*marinum flumen*) an Arm of the Sea, and at laſt became his Martyr, as well as his Bearer. Another Office you may there find to the three Kings of *Collen* (ſ), who are invocated by the Names of *King Jaſpar*, *King Melchior*, *and King Balthazar*, and are intreated *by the King of Kings whom they merited to ſee crying in his Cradle*, *to compaſſionate their Suppliants in their miſeries.* (t) A farther Office may be there ſeen for the moſt holy *Urſula*, and *the eleven thouſand Virgins*, her Companions, who were all Martyrs. The Hiſtory of theſe Virgin-Martyrs is variouſly reported by their own Authors, the moſt agree that they were killed at *Collen* by the barbarous *Hunns*, where they were all interr'd, and many of their precious Reliques are reſerv'd to this day; and it did not a little encourage them in their Martyrdom, that Chriſt had ſent his Vicar amongſt them, Pope *Ciriacus*, to abſolve them from their ſins, and to die a Martyr with them. Others indeed report otherwiſe concerning them, and we Hereticks in ſuch uncertainties muſt be excuſed if we doubt whether ever there were any ſuch number of Virgin (u) Martyrs or no, and do think the Church of *Rome* ridiculous (to ſay no more at preſent) in conferring on ſuch Imaginary Saints Religious Worſhip and Invocation. I could inſtance in many more ſuch like Popiſh Saints, (w) as the *Seven Sleepers*, who ſlept in a time of grievous Perſecution 362 years, and afterwards in the Reign of *Theodoſius* awak'd, and are deſervedly worſhip'd (one would think) in the Church of *Rome*. And St. *Longinus* (x) the Souldier, that with his Lance pierc'd our Lord Jeſus upon the Croſs, and being almoſt blind, with the ſparkling of that Blood, immediately received his ſight, and believed; and being inſtructed by the Apoſtles, forſook his Military Profeſſion, and lived thirty eight years a Monaſtick life in *Capadocia*; and was at laſt martyred for the Chriſtian Faith.

(q) *Et ſec. uſum Romanum.*

(r) *L. 7. Faſtor.*

(ſ) *Hor. ſec. uſum Sarum & ſec. uſum Roman.* 1570.

(t) *V. Brev. Rom. reform.* 21 *Octob. Hortul. animæ ſec. uſ. antiq. Ecc. Rom.*

(u) *In the Golden Legend printed at* Lond. A. 1512. *the company is made* 26000.

(w) *Brev. ſec. uſ. Sarum* 27 *Julii & miſſale Sacrum* A. 1554

(x) *Brev. Rom. antiq. Martii* 15.

Whoſo conſults the *Roman Breviaries*, will meet with many more of this ſort; yea, with ſome that their own Authors call Symbolical Saints, which yet are worſhipped and invocated with the greateſt formality: but enough of this ſecond particular, that 'tis an abſurd and irrational ſervice.

3. This practice is Idolatrous. The Romaniſts are much offended at this charge: *Any man* (y) (ſays a late Writer) *of common reaſon*

'Tis Idolatrous

(y) *Cath. no Idol.* p. 334.

would think it were as easie to prove Snow to be black, as so innocent a practice to be Idolatry. But it may be he is mistaken. It is agreed on all hands that Idolatry, in the proper notion of it, is a giving that worship and service to the Creature, which is due only to God: yea, though men worship God, yet if they worship a Creature also, they are Idolaters. The Apostle (z) reproves those *that worshipped the Creature* (παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα) *besides the Creator.* And this was the Idolatry of those that *Shalmaneser* sent to inhabit *Samaria*, (a) *they feared the Lord, and served other, or their own gods.* Now that the Papists give religious worship to Saints and Angels as well as unto God, is evident by their own profession and practice: only they think they may help themselves out with the aforesaid distinction of (b) *Latria* and *Dulia*, the verity of which we have already seen. To the same purpose is that distinction of theirs, of superiour and absolute Worship as due to God, and inferiour and relative Worship as applicable to the Creature. Whereas if, by inferiour and relative, they mean religious Worship, as they must do if they speak to the thing in question, then we answer, that there is no foundation for any such distinction in the whole Book of God. And it would have stood the *Arrians* in great stead if it had been then invented, for by the help of such a distinction they might easily have enervated the force of the Apostle's Argument, whereby he proves the Deity of Christ, because the *Angels of God are enjoined to worship him.* To this they might readily have replied, That the Text intends a religious Worship of an inferiour degree, such as may be given to the most excellent Creature. If the *Socinians* now get this by the end, they may thank the Papists for it.

(z) Rom. 1. 25. *Non tantum Creatorem sed præterea Creaturas coluerunt sic παρὰ usurpatur;* 1 Cor. 3. Gal. 1.

(a) 2 Kin. 17. 33

(b) עבד *servire, modo verbo* δουλεύειν, *modo verbo* λατρεύειν *indifferentur sit versum. Confer* Luc. 4. 8. cum Deut. 6. 13. & 10. 20. item Act. 7. 6, 7. cum Gen. 15. 13. *Idem Septuag. indifferenter verterunt, per vocem* λατρεύειν *reddiderunt,* Exod. 4. 23. & 23. 25. Deut. 6. 13. & 10. 12, 20. & 11. 13. Josh. 24. 15. Judg. 10. 16. Dan. 6. 20. *per vocem* δουλεύειν *reddiderunt* Deut. 13. 4. Judg. 2. 7. 1 Sam. 7. 3. & 12. 11, 20, 24. 1 King. 16. 31. 1 Chron. 28. 9. Psal. 2. 11. & 100. 1. *cum multis aliis. Laurent. Valla. in Annot. suis in c. 4. Matthæ. Evang. fuse probat nihil interesse inter* δουλεύειν & λατρεύειν *idque fretus authoritate principium Græcorum.*

Here let it be farther considered, that the Adoration and Invocation of Saints and Angels in the Church of *Rome*, is not only Idolatrous, but it is in imitation of the old Pagan Idolatry, and a manifest reviving of their Doctrines of *Dæmons*, which is foretold in Scripture as that which should fall out in the last days amongst the degenerate and apostatizing Christians. So the Apostle tells us in 1 *Tim.* 4. 12. *That in the latter times some shall revolt from the Faith, giving head to seducing Spirits, and* (διδασκαλίαις δαιμονίων) *Doctrines of Devils, or Dæmons*; that is, (c) Doctrines which they are Objects, rather than Authors of. Doctrines concerning *Dæmons*, as *Doctrines of Baptism and of laying on of hands, and of the Resurrection of the Dead, and of Eternal Judgment*, are Doctrines about and concerning all these. Now what these *Dæmons* were, and what the Heathens Doctrine about them was, may be read at large in *Mede*'s Apostasie of the Latter Times, (a Book which the Papists

(c) *The Genitive* δαιμονίων, *is to be taken passively for the Object of these Doctrines. See the like* Heb. 6. 2. Act. 13. 12. Tit. 2. 10. Gal. 2. 20. *Jos. Mede.*

Papists never cared to meddle with) there the Author hath made it manifest, that the *Gentiles* Idolatry, and Theology of *Dæmons*, is reviv'd and re-inforc'd in the Church of *Rome*. They fancied that their *Dæmons* were an inferiour sort of Deified Powers, that stood in the midst between the Sovereign gods and them. The Sovereign gods they supposed so sublime and pure, that Mortals could not, might not approach to them: therefore they introduced this middle sort of Divine Powers to be as Mediators and Agents betwixt them.

* These *Dæmons* or Mediators were supposed to be of two sorts, some were the souls of men who were Deified after their death; the Canonizing of *Heroes* and deceased Worthies is ancient indeed, 'tis older than the Papacy: *Rome* when 'twas Heathen had a custom to Canonize their deceased Emperours, and call them *Divi* or Saints too. We read of *Divus Augustus* as well as of *Divus Augustinus*. Another sort of *Dæmons* (d) they had, *which were more sublime, which never dwelt in mortal bodies, but were from the beginning always the same.* This second sort of *Dæmons* doth fitly answer to those Spiritual Powers we call Angels, as the former sort doth to those which with us are called Saints. To these *Dæmons* they built Temples; their Images, Shrines and Reliques, they religiously adored: so that in many respects the Pagan Idolatry was a pattern of the Popish Idolatry, the one is exactly parallel with the other, it hath a great affinity to it, and its very foundation from it. I know that it will be objected that those *Dæmons* or inferiour Deities of the Heathens were the souls of wicked Men and Devils, whereas those who are invocated and adored by the Romanists are the Spirits of just Men and Angels. To which I answer, That though in that respect there be a disparity, yet the Objection hath no force, because the Idolatry of the Heathen did not lie in making an ill choice of the *Dæmons* they worshipped, but in giving that religious Worship to a Creature which was due only to the Creator. Let him be a good or a bad Angel, a just or a wicked person, so long as he is a Creature, 'tis Idolatry to defer religious Worship or Invocation to him.

* *Platonici opinantur quod Dæmones Mediatores Sanct. inter Deos & homines per quos ad Deorum amicitias homines ambiant:* V. Aug. de civit. Dei, L. 9. c. 9. c. 11.

Divi qui Cœlestes semper habiti, & qui in cœlum vocati. Cic. de legibus, l. 2.

(d) *Plutarch. de defect. oracul. Apuleius: Sanctus est & superius aliud, augustiusque Dæmonum genus, qui semper a corporis compedibus & noxibus liberi. Ex hac sublimiori Dæmonum copia autumat Plato singulis hominibus in vita agenda testes & custodes singulos additos.*

Æneas Patrem defunctum invocat. Nunc pateras libate Jovi precibusque vocate Anchisen genitorem.

Before I conclude this point, let me give you the opinion of one of their own way upon this matter: his words are these: (e) *Many Christians do for the most part transgress in a good thing, that they worship the*

(e) *Multi Christiani in re bona plerumque peccant, quod Divos Divasque non aliter venerantur quam Deum: nec video in multis quid sit discrimen inter eorum opinionem de Sanctis, & id quod Gentiles putabant de Diis suis.* Lud. vir. notis in Aug. de civit. Dei, l. 8. c. 27. Edit. An. 1596.

He-Saints and She-Saints no otherwise than they worship God; nor do I see in many things wherein their opinion of the Saints doth differ from that which the Heathen had of their gods. What Protestant Heretick could have spoken more plainly? To carry on the allusion, consider how the Heathen had their Tutelar gods for Countries and Cities; in like manner the Papists have their Saint-Patrons for particular Places and Nations; as * *St. George for England, St. Patrick for Ireland, S. David for Wales, St. James for Spain, St. Dennis for France*, &c. The Heathen did appropriate particular Employments and Offices to their *Dæmons* or Deities; so do the Papists to their He and She-Saints: only (as one observes) the Superstition and folly of new *Rome* in this exceeds that of the old, that they could content themselves, with *Æsculapius*, only in all matters that related to Physick and Diseases, but these have almost as many Saints to invoke, as there are Maladies to be cured; one Saint is good for sore Breasts (*g*), another for the Tooth-ach (*h*), a third for Feavers (*i*), a fourth for Inflammations (*k*), and so on. Nay, in some cases they will not trust themselves in the hands of one Saint alone; as for instance, in case of the Pestilence they join St. *Roch* with St. *Sebastian* for surer aid. The Heathen were wont to invoke *Lucina* in the Pains of Childbirth, but the Papists think St. *Margaret* to be the better Midwife; and St. *Nicholas* now in their esteem hath as much, or more power in the Seas than ever *Neptune* had.

* *ut Martem Latii sic nos te dive Georgi Mantuan.*

(*g*) S. Agatha.
(*h*) S Apollonia.
(*i*) S. Sigismund.
(*k*) S. Anthony

'Tis injurious to Christ.

4. This practice is injurious unto Christ. It intrencheth upon his Mediatory Office, and doth manifestly rob him of his (*l*) Royal Prerogative, which is to be the one, and only Mediator betwixt God and man. Hear what the Apostle says, 1 *Tim.* 2. 5. *There is one God, and one Mediator betwixt God and man, the man Christ Jesus.* One exclusively, one, and but one. In this Office Christ hath no Sharers or Partners. As God is but one, and there is no other; so the Mediator is but one, and there is no other. The Papists may as well fancy many subordinate gods, as subordinate Mediators betwixt him and us. I am not ignorant of their distinction, how that there is but one *Mediator of Redemption*, but there are and may be many *Mediators of Intercession*. To which I answer, That the Scripture knows no such difference or distinction of Mediators; and in Christ they are one and the same thing; in this he intercedes that he hath satisfied for us, and 'tis in consideration of his death that God receives us into his favour. And if the distinction be admitted, the word *between* (in the Text forecited) doth evidently shew that he rather speaks of a Mediator of Intercession: for 'tis improper to say that Christ is a Redeemer between God and man;

(*l*) *Quid tam proprium Christi quam advocatum apud Deum patrem adstare populorum,* Ambros. in Psal. 39. *Pro quo nullus interpellat sed ipse pro omnibus, hic unus verusque Mediator est,* Aug. cont. parmen. L. 2. c 8. *And in the same place; The mutual prayers,* saith he, *of all the Members, which yet labour upon the earth, ought to ascend up to the Head, which is gone before into Heaven, in whom we have the remission of our sins. For if St.* Paul *were a Mediator, the other Apostles would be so also, and so there would be many Mediators, which would not agree with that which elsewhere he saith, That there is one Mediator between God and man.*

and

and yet that we may know that he doth not intercede for us only by his Prayers, but by his Paſſion and Merits alſo, 'tis added, *That he gave himſelf a ranſom for us:* and in the 1 *John* 2. 1. when Jeſus Chriſt the righteous is ſpoken of as our *Advocate*, 'tis preſently added, that *He is the propitiation for our ſins*; which ſhews that his Interceſſion conſiſts in his being a propitiation *for ſin*. *The High Prieſt* under the Law was a Figure or Type of Chriſt in this reſpect, for he was Typically a Mediator both of Interceſſion and Redemption. There was no other ordinary Mediator of Interceſſion but he; and hence it is that he went alone into the Holy of Holies to offer up Incenſe unto God; he had no Partners with him in his Office. So Jeſus Chriſt is entred alone into the Holy Place not made with hands, to wit, Heaven it ſelf, to appear in the preſence of God for us. In the Tabernacle of this World, (as it was in the firſt Tabernacle) there you may happily find many Prieſts whom you may employ as Agents for you with God; but in the ſecond Tabernacle, which is Heaven, there is but one High Prieſt that hath to do in that Holy Place, but one Agent do deal with God for you. There is but one Advocate admitted into that Court to appear for you, and plead your Cauſe. 'Tis neceſſary for the conſtituting of an Advocate or Interceſſor for us in Heaven, that he be Commiſſionated and Deputed by God unto that Office; he muſt not arrogate or take it upon himſelf, unleſs he be called thereunto. Now this Qualification doth ſuit with Chriſt and no other; no Saint or Angel had ever any Commiſſion or Deputation from God for this ſervice; to which of the Angels or Saints did he ever ſay, *Sit thou at my right hand*, receive the Devotions and Petitions of Sinners on Earth, and preſent them to me in Heaven? I have read indeed that Angels are deputed to be their Guardians and Miniſters, but not to be their Advocates and Mediators.

One thing I would add which deſerves our Conſideration, that theſe Popiſh Diſtinguiſhers do make the Saints in Heaven to be their Mediators of Redemption, as well as Interceſſion: for no Petition is more frequent in their Offices to the Saints, than that by their Merits, as well as Prayers, they might obtain ſuch and ſuch bleſſings here, and eternal Life hereafter. If it would not tire you, I could treat you with many ſcores of inſtances: For a taſte, let me give you a piece of a Prayer to one *Etheldred* an Engliſh Saint, and 'tis in theſe words: (m) *Look, O moſt Gracious Virgin, upon our troubles which we deſervedly ſuſtain, and by the Merits and Interceſſion of thy holineſs, both appeaſe the anger of the Judge whom we have offended, and obtain that pardon which we have not deſerved.* But above all, commend me to one of our Country-folk, and that is the honeſt man I named before, even St. *Thomas Becket*, whoſe blood they ſuppoſed of old to be as Sovereign as Chriſt's himſelf. 'Tis

(m) *O omnes Sancti & Sanctæ Dei ſubvenite mihi, &c. ut per merita veſtra pervenire valeam ad æternæ beatitudinis patriam.*

Horæ ſec. uſ. Rom. Per tuæ Sanctitatis merita & interceſſiones iram judicis placa quam offendimus. Brev. Sarum, fol. 100.

not

not enough to pray (as they do) *that by* (n) *his Merits and Prayers they may be translated from Vice to Virtues, and from the Prison to the Kingdom*; this they hope for from more ordinary Saints: but as for St. *Thomas*, they pray, (o) that *by his Blood they may climb to Heaven, as he has done before them.* Now judge by what hath been said, if the Saints be not made Mediators of Redemption, as well as Intercession.

(n) *Te supplices exoramus ut ejus meritis & precibus a vitiis ad virtutes, & a carcere transferamur ad regnum.* Brev. Sar. in Transl. Tho. 7 Julii.

(o) *Tu per Thomæ sanguinem quem pro te impendit, fac nos Christe scandere quo Thomas ascendit.*

By that same Blood *Thomas* for thee expended,
Christ, raise us thither whither he's ascended.

Jesu Christe per Thomæ vulnera,
Quæ nos ligant relaxa scelera,
Ne Captivos ferant ad infera,
Hostis Mundus vel carnis opera.

Deus patitur se misericorditer reconciliari propter merita & intercessiones Sanctorum, Colonienſ. in ſuo Antidotagm.

I shall have done with this Head, when I have observed one thing more, (for the sake of which I shall never be reconciled to *Rome*) that is, they don't only degrade our Lord Jesus Christ, and bring in Partners upon him in his Office of Intercession, but they disparage him too, and report that * he being a Judge as well as an Advocate, is more inclined to severity; that we may expect more pity and compassion from his Mother, and the other Saints, who are more disposed to mercy than he is. Yea, I have understood that in some of their Churches they have pictured Christ frowning and casting darts at sinners, whom they make to flee from him as if they were afraid of him; and then the Virgin *Mary* is brought in as shrowding of them, and interposing betwixt him and them. Oh unparallel'd wickedness! Oh ye vile and wretched Papists! Have you never read what is reported of Christ in the Scriptures of Truth? that *he is a merciful and faithful High Priest*, one that hath *compassion on poor sinners, as having himself been toucht with the feeling of their Infirmities.* Is this your dealing with him, to disgrace as well as to displace him? What mean your great Doctors by telling the World, that the Intercession of the Saints is more available than his? that (p) as he wrought greater Miracles by the Saints than by himself, so often-times he sheweth the force of their Intercession more than his own. What was his meaning who upon this Question, (Whether it be better to pray to God by Christ alone, or by the Saints?) determined it thus, *Oratio fusa per Sanctos melior est*, 'tis better to do it by the Saints? But 'tis time to conclude this part of my Discourse, which was to prove, the practice of the Church of *Rome* in praying

* *Christus non solum advocatus est sed & judex cuncta discussurus, ita quod nihil inultum remanebit. Cum itaque vix justus ante cum sit securus, quomodo peccator ante eum tanquam advocatum accederet? Ideo Deus providit nobis de Advocata, quæ mitis & suavis est in qua nihil invenitur asperum.* Antonin. part. 4. *summæ Titul.* 15.

(p) Hen. Fitz. *of the Mass, l.* 2. *part.* 2. *c.* 3. *Salmer. in Ep.* 1. *ad Tim. c.* 2.

praying to Saints and Angels to be blame-worthy and abominable in the ſight of God.

It remains now that I examine the Pleas the Papiſts have for this practice. You'll ſuppoſe they have ſomething to ſay for themſelves in this behalf, and ſo they have. I ſhall not wittingly conceal any thing of force, which is urged or pleaded by them. You have underſtood already that they don't pretend the warrant of God's Word for their ſo doing. Thoſe of them that have endeavoured to find this practice in the Scripture, have fumbled ſo lamentably that others of their own party are aſhamed of them. Who can forbear ſmiling to hear it inferr'd, that becauſe the rich man prayed Father *Abraham* to ſend *Lazarus* to his aid, therefore 'tis lawful to invocate the Saints, and to deſire their aſſiſtance? There is one Text of Scripture which ſeems to patronize the Invocation of Angels, and 'tis ſtrongly urged by ſome upon that account, and that is in *Gen.* 48. 16. there *Jacob* ſays, *The Angel which redeemed me from all evil, bleſs the Lads.* Theſe words of *Jacob* (ſays a learned Writer) are not ſpoken to an Angel, but of or concerning an Angel (*q*), and the ſpeech is (ὐχικὸν not προτρεπτικὸν) by way of wiſh or option, not by way of prayer or ſupplication. But the true anſwer is this, That by the Angel in that place we are not to underſtand (*Angelus Domini*, but *Angelus Dominus*) an Angel of the Lord, but the Angel that is the Lord. (*r*) The Lord himſelf goes under that Name in Scripture, He's called the *Angel of the Covenant*, and the *Counſel of God.* The Lord was the Angel with whom *Jacob* before had wreſtled, and he was the Angel whom *Jacob* here invocated. He prayed him to bleſs his Nephews, to whom he had ſaid a little before, *I will not let thee go unleſs thou bleſs me*, and that was not a created Angel, but Jeſus Chriſt the Creator of Angels. (*ſ*) The ſame Jeſus is the Angel ſpoken of *Rev.* 8. 3. who is ſaid there, *to ſtand at the Altar with a Golden Cenſor, and to have much Incenſe given him that he ſhould offer it with the Prayers of all Saints upon the Golden Altar which was before the Throne:* This muſt be underſtood of our High Prieſt the Lord Jeſus Chriſt: It is He only that offereth or preſenteth our Prayers with the Incenſe of his Merits upon the Golden Altar, *i. e.* upon himſelf, unto God for a ſweet ſmelling ſavour (*t.*)

But what they want in the Scripture, they ſay they have in the Writings of the ancient Fathers for the juſtifying of this practice. (*u*) *Bellarmine* ſays, that all the Fathers, *Greek* and *Latine*, teach that the Saints are to be invocated. (*w*) *Salmeron*, (*x*) *Stapleton*, and others ſpeak the ſame Language. Theſe kind of men, ſays Biſhop *Uſher*, *have ſo*

Popiſh Pleas for Invocation of Saints.

(*q*) *Montague* in Treat. of Invocation of Saints, p. 87.

(*r*) Mal. 3. 1. Iſai. 63. 9.

(*ſ*) V. Athanor. 4. cont. Arrian. p. 260. *The Patriarch Jacob joined none with God but him only who is the word, whom for this cauſe he called Angel, becauſe it is he alone who manifeſteth the Father to us.* Irænæus, Ambroſe, Rupertus, Viega, Haymo, &c. *of this mind.* (*t*) Epheſ. 5. 2. Heb. 4. 14. & 9. 14. & 13. 10, 15. *No created Angel is ſufficient for this, to receive and offer up the Prayers of all Saints.* (u) *Omnes Patres Græci & Latini docent Sanctos eſſe invocandos.* Bell. de Eccl. Triump. l. 1. c. 6. (*w*) Salmer. *in* 1 Tim. 2. diſp. 7. (*x*) Staplet. fortr. p. 1, c. 9. Jo. Azor. Inſt. Moral. Tom. 1. Lib. 9. c. 10.

inured

inured their Tongues to talk of the Fathers, and all the Fathers, that they can hardly use any other form of speech; and having told such tales as these so often over, at last they perswade themselves they are true indeed. The same learned person in his Answer to a Challenge made by a Jesuite in *Ireland*, hath this passage: *However our Challenger* (says he) *gives it out, that Prayer to Saints was of great account amongst the Fathers of the Primitive Church for the first four hundred years after Christ, yet for nine parts of that time I dare be bold to say, that he is not able to produce as much as one testimony out of any Father whereby it may appear that any account at all was made of it:* Nay, he makes it evident they were all against it. They that are desirous to be farther informed in this matter, may do well to consult his Quotations out of the ancient Fathers, which he hath faithfully given his Reader, and there he will find them in words at length. (z) The like good service is done to my hand by others. I could, if there were room for it, fill many Pages with apposite Testimonies and Citations, but that would swell this Discourse too much. Take two or three for a taste.

(z) *V. Dallæi disput. advers Latin. de cultus religiosi objecto traditionem, L. 3. & p. 340. ad p. 582.*

Pet. du Moulin de novitate Papismi. Dr. Ferne's *Answer to* Spencer, *Sect. 2. from p. 257. to p. 285.* John Polyander's *Refutation of a Popish Epistle concerning the Invocation of Saints. Exam. Concilii Tridentini per Martin Chemnitium, Juellum contra Hardingum, Whitaker contra Duræum,* &c.

Ignatius (who flourisht about the 140 year of our Lord) in his Epistle to the *Philadelphians*, thus writes: (a) *You Virgins have none but Jesus Christ alone before your eyes in your Prayers, and the Father of Jesus Christ.* It seems that Christians in his time did not so much as look to, or call upon the Virgin *Mary* her self. To the same purpose is that of *Origen*, (b) *We must pray to him alone who is God above all things.* To *him also we must pray, who is the Word, the only Son of God, and the first-born of all Creatures.* The Writings of that Father are full of evident Testimonies against this practice, but I have promised brevity; only let me add this passage of his, *That we ought not to worship our fellow-worshippers*, to pray *to those that pray themselves.* *Athanasius* wrote as much as he about this matter, and his contending with the *Arians* gave him occasion for it: They maintained that Christ was a meer Creature, and yet they prayed to him; and he on the contrary asserted, That if he were created, he must not be invocated. (c) *To God alone,*

(a) Αἱ παρθένοι μόνον τὸν Χριστὸν πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν ἔχετε, καὶ τὸν αὐτοῦ πατέρα ἐν τῇ ὀυχαῖς. Ignat. Ep. 6.

(b) Μόνῳ προσευκτέον τῷ ὄντι πάσι Θεῷ προσευκτέον τε τῷ μονογενεῖ, καὶ πρωτοτόκῳ πάσης κτίσεως λόγῳ Θεῷ. Tom. 8. cont. Celsum, p. 395. V. eodem libro, p. 381, 384, 402, 416, 420 & Tom. 5. cont. Celsum, l. 8. in Epist. ad Rom. c. 10.

(c) Τῷ Θεῷ δεῖ μόνῳ προσεύχεσθαι καὶ τοῦτο ἴσασι καὶ αὐτοὶ ἄγγελοι, &c. in orat. 3. cont. Arrian. V. orat. 4. Origen l. 8. cont. Celsum, p. 432, 433. hath this passage, which for the greater profit to some Readers I put into English. *If* Celsus *will have us to procure the good will of any others after him that is God over all, let him consider, that as when the body is moved, the shadow thereof doth follow it; so in like manner having God propitious to us, who is over all, it followeth that we shall have all his friends, both Angels and Saints, loving to us, for they have a fellow-feeling with them that are thought fit to find favour with God. Neither are they only favourable unto such, but they work with them also that are willing to do service unto him, who is God over all, and are friendly to them, and pray and intreat with them: so as we boldly say, that when men which with resolution propose unto themselves the best things, do pray unto God, many thousands of the sacred powers pray together with them unspoken to.* Ἀκλήτοι συνεύχονται. V. Cyril. in Joan. c. 16.

saith

saith he, *it belongeth to be worshipped, and the Angels themselves are not ignorant hereof: for although they excel in Glory, yet they are Creatures, and are none of those that are worshipped, but of those that worship the Lord.* And again, *Because Jesus Christ is not a Creature, but is begotten of the very substance of the Father, and is by Nature the Son of God, therefore is he worshipped.*

So much for Greek Fathers, the Latine Fathers were of the same mind. *Tertullian*, who lived about the beginning of the third Century, he tells us, (d) *That such and such things he might not pray for from any other but from him of whom he knew he should obtain them, because it is he who alone is able to give, and I am he for whom they must be obtained, being his servant who observe him alone.* *Novatianus*, (whose Book of the Trinity is added to *Tertullian*'s Works) he says, (e) *If Christ be only a man, why is a man called upon in our Prayers as a Mediator? seeing that the invocation of a man is judged of no efficacy to Salvation. Why also is hope reposed in him, seeing hope in man is accursed?* And again, *If Christ be only man, how is he present being called upon every where? seeing this is not the nature of man, but of God, that he can be present at every place.* *Ambrose* in his Funeral Oration upon *Theodosius* the Emperour, hath this passage, (f) *Thou alone, O Lord, art to be invocated, Thou art to be intreated to make up the want of him in his Sons.* *Augustine* in his Confessions thus prays unto God, (g) *I confess and know my soul is defiled, but who shall cleanse it? or to whom else should I cry besides thee?* And again, (h) *Whom should I find that might reconcile me unto thee? Should I have gone to the Angels? with what Prayer? with what Sacraments? Many endeavouring to return unto thee, and not being able to do it by themselves, as I hear, have tried these things, and have fallen into the desire of curious Visions, and were accounted worthy of Delusions.* The same Father asserts, (i) *That in the Catholick Church it is divinely and singularly delivered, That no Creature is to be worshipped by the soul, but he only who is the Creator of all things.* And again, (k) *Jesus Christ is the Priest, who being now entred within the Vail, alone there, of them that have been partakers of flesh, doth make Intercession for us; in figure of which thing, amongst that first People, and in that first Temple, the Priest only did enter into the*

(d) *Hæc ab alio orare non possum, quam a quo me Scio consecuturum, quoniam & ipse est qui solum præstat, &c.* Apologetic. c. 30.

(e) *Si homo tantum modo Christus, quommodo adest ubique invocatus, cum hæc hominis natura non sit sed Dei, ut adesse omni loco possit, &c.* De Trinitate, c. 14.

(f) *Tu solus Domine invocandus es, tu rogandus ut eum in filiis repræsentes.*

(g) *Habet Anima quæ offendant oculos tuos, sed quis mundabit eam? aut cui alteri præter te clamabo.* Confess. l. 1. c. 5.

(h) *Quem invenirem qui me reconciliaret tibi? an eundum mihi fuit ad Angelos? qua prece? quibus Sacramentis? Multi conantes ad te redire, neque per seipsos valentes, sicut audio, tentaverunt hæc & inciderunt in desiderium curiosarum visionum, & digni habiti sunt illusionibus.* Confess. L. 10 c. 42.

(i) *Divine & singulariter in Ecclesia Catholica traditur, nullam Creaturam colendam esse animæ sed ipsum tantummodo rerum omnium Creatorem.* De quantit. Animæ, c. 34.

(k) *Christus Sacerdos est qui nunc ingressus in interiora veli, solus ibi ex his qui carnem gestaverant interpellat pro nobis; in cujus rei figura in illo primo Populo, & in illo primo Templo unus Sacerdos intrabat in Sancta Sanctorum, populus omnis foras stabat,* in Psalm 64.

Holy of Holies, and all the people stood without. Once more, (l) *The worshipping* (says he) *of men that are dead, should be no part of our Religion, because if they lived piously, they will not seek that kind of honour; they are to be honoured therefore for Imitation, not to be adored for Religion.*

(l) *Non sit nobis religio cultus hominum mortuorum quia si pie vixerunt tales non quærant honores, &c.*

Honorandi ergo sunt propter imitationem, non adorandi propter religionem. Aug. de vera religione, c. 55. *Qui supplicant mortuis rationem hominum non tenent.* Lact. Instit. divin. l. 2. c. 18.

These are some of those many Testimonies which are found in the Writings of the Ancients. I shall add but one more saying of him whom I last mentioned, (and it's worth our notice:) (m) *The Prayer* (says he) *which is not made by Jesus Christ, not only cannot blot out sin, but it self also is sin.* If any shall say that there are some passages in *Ambrose*, *Austin*, and other Writers near that Age, that favour this opinion or practice of invocating Saints: I answer, That if it be granted, we may gather this from it, That meer Humane Writings are no Foundation of our Faith, nor can any certainty be had from those who speak or write with such inconstancy. * Farther it is confest, that towards the end of the fourth Century, this Leaven diffused it self in the Church. The occasion mainly (as some upon good grounds affirm) was this. The Christians of those times did greatly reverence the memory of the Martyrs, and did often resort to their Sepulchres, and there offered up their Prayers unto that God for whose Cause they laid down their Lives. And because God was pleased to give gracious answers to those Prayers, and to do many wonderful things for the honouring of that Christian Profession, which those Worthies maintained unto the death; therefore some began to imagine that all this was done at their suit and mediation: yea, some affirmed that the Martyrs themselves appeared to divers that were relieved at the places of their Memorials. He that would see more of the rise of this practice, let him consult *Chemnicius*

(m) *Oratio quæ non fit per Christum non solum non potest delere peccatum, sed ipsa fit peccatum.* in Psal. 108.

* *Besides, their Writings are corrupted by the Romanists, and many spurious and supposititious sayings are fathered upon the Fathers; of which I could give many instances, and some in this very case. The deifying and invocating of Saints began to appear in the Church somewhat early, the grounds whereof were most strange reports of wonders shewed upon those who approached the Shrines of Martyrs, and prayed at their Memories and Sepulchres. Devils charmed, Diseases cured, the Blind saw, the Lame walkt, yea the Dead revived, &c. which the Doctors of those times avouched to be done by the power and prayers of the glorified Martyrs, and by the notice they took of mens devotions at their Sepulchres; though at first those devotions were directed to God alone, and such places only chosen for the stirring up of zeal and fervour. But whiles the world stood in admiration of these wonders, men were soon perswaded to call on those Martyrs as Patrons and Mediators, by whose power with God, and notice of things done on earth, they thought that these signs and miracles appeared. Mede's* Apostasie of the latter times. Circa A. D. 370. per Basil. Nyssen. Nazianz invoc. Sanct. *in publicos Ecclesiæ conventus invehi cœpit. Hi primi fuerunt qui eam ex privatis & Monachorum devotionibus in Ecclesiam invexerunt. Cum enim in Rhetorum Scholis educati, eloquentiæ laudem affectarent, orationes panegyricas declamatoriis flosculis & Rhetoricis Apostrophis, & quæ præterea ad figuram περσωποποιΐαν pertinent, ita exornarunt, ut opinionem, de comprecationibus & auxiliis Sanctorum, quæ Origenis tempore apocrypha & privata erant, tanquam publicum dogma in immensum exaggerarent, & ad compellationes eorum, quoniam memoriam celebrabant, orationes converterent; atque ita figuram orationis ad formam invocationis declinarent. Cujus tamen exempla nec ex Scriptura, nec ex vetustiori & puriori Ecclesia habebant. Circa Augustini tempora materia illa invoc. Sanctorum incidit in poetas, qui invocationes Musarum, Dæmonum & Heroum poetica imitatione & licentia ad Martyres transtulerunt.* Circa A.D. 600. addita & inserta erat Litaniæ a Greg. Magno. V. plura in Chemnic. Exam. C. Trid.

in

in his judicious Examination of the Council of *Trent*. The progress of it, together with the opposition it met with in the Church of God, is not unknown to those that have lookt into the History of those times. Although therefore the Popish invocation of Saints be ancient in respect of some of their other Innovations, yet 'tis novel in its self, and in respect of true Antiquity. I shall conclude this Head, when I have shewd you, that not only particular Fathers, but whole Councils have condemn'd the practice in question. The Council of * *Carthage* was against the invocation of Saints, and the Council of *Laodicea* did censure the invocation of Angels. In the 35 Canon of that Council, it was thus determined: (n) *That Christians ought not to leave the Church of God, and go and call upon Angels, and make Meetings, which are things forbidden. If any man therefore be found giving himself to this secret Idolatry, let him be accursed; because he hath forsaken the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and hath applied himself to Idolatry.* Theodoret (in his Exposition of the Epistle to the *Colossians*) doth twice mention this Canon, and declare the sense of it. Upon *Col.* 3. 17. (o) *The Apostle* (saith he) *commandeth to adorn our words and deeds with the Commemoration of our Lord Christ, and to send up Thanksgiving to God and the Father by him, and not by the Angels. The Synod of* Laodicea *following also this Rule, and desiring to heal that old Disease*, (viz. Angel-worship) *made a Law that they should not pray unto Angels, nor forsake our Lord Jesus Christ.* And on Col. 2. he adds, (p) *That this vice continued long in* Phrygia *and* Pisidia, *for which cause the Synod (assembled in* Laodicea *the chief City of* Phrygia) *forbad them by a Law to pray unto Angels; and even to this day among them and their borderers, there are Oratories of St.* Michael *to be seen.* (q) *Oecumenius* after him hath much the same words upon the same place.

* Concil. Carthag. 3.

(n) Ὁν δεῖ Χριστιανὸς ἐγκαταλείπειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἀπέρχεσθαι, καὶ ἀγγέλους ὀνομάζειν· καὶ συνάξεις ποιεῖν ἀπερ ἀπηγόρευται, &c. Concil. Laodic. Can. 35.

(o) Τότε ἐπομένη τῷ νόμῳ καὶ ἡ ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ σύνοδος, καὶ τῷ παλαιῷ ἐκείνῳ πάθει θεραπεῦσαι βουλομένη, ἐνομοθέτησε μὴ δεῖν, κ.τ.λ. μηδὲ καταλαμπάνειν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν. In Col. 3. 17. Consule eundem in cap. 2. ult.

(p) Ἔμεινε δὲ τοῦτο κατὰ Φρυγίαν τὸ ἔθος, ὡς καὶ ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ σύνοδον κωλύσαι τὸ προσεύχεσθαι ἀγγέλοις, καὶ προσδοκᾶσθαι, &c. (q) Oecumen M.S. in Col. 2. V. Not. ad Origenis Libros cont. Celsum, p 483. Augustine *calls those Heretics that were inclined to the worship of Angels*, De Hæres. c 39. Epiphanius *speaks of a sort of Heretics (called* Collyridians) *from the* Collyrides, *or Cakes, which they used to offer to the Virgin* Mary. *These he at large refutes, and says that neither* Elias, *nor* John, *nor* Thecla, *nor any of the Saints is to be worshipped. And again, God will not have the Angels to be worshipped, much less her that was born of* Anna. *And again, Which of the Prophets have permitted a man to be worshipped, that I may not say a woman? The blessed Virgin is a choice Vessel indeed, but yet a woman. Let* Mary *be in honour, but let the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, be worshipped.* Τῷ Μαρίαν μηδεὶς προσκυνείτω, *Let no man worship* Mary. *Again,* Μὴ φαγέτω τις, &c. *Let none eat of this errour touching holy* Mary; *for although the tree be beautiful, yet it is not for meat: And although* Mary *be most excellent, and holy, and to be honoured; yet she is not to be worshipped. Again, She was indeed a Virgin, and honourable, and not given to us for adoration, but one who did her self worship him, who was born of her in the flesh.* Epiphan. Hæres. 79. p 446, 447, 448. *There also he exhorteth Christians to put on a man-like mind, and to beat down* γυναικῶν μανίαν τάυτην, *the madness of these women. For it seems in those days it was the womens Heresie, though now it hath obtained amongst the Romanists, both males and females.* Gregory Nyssen *against* Eunomius, l. 5. *hath this excellent passage; we are taught to understand, that whatsoever is created is a different thing from the Divine Nature; and that we are to worship and adore* Μόνῳ τῷ ἀκτίστῳ φύσει, *that Nature only which is uncreated, whose character is this, That it neither at any time began to be, nor ever shall cease to be. The Spanish Inquisitors, Anno* 1584. *took care the word* (only) *should be blotted out.* Chrysostom *in his third Homily on the first Chapter to the* Hebrews, *hath this saying; why do you gape after Angels? they are ser-*

wants to the Son of God, and are sent to divers places for our sakes. And Hom. 18. *on the Epistle to the* Romans, *he says, Unto whom shalt thou flee? whom wilt thou call upon to fight for, and help thee? shall it be to* Abraham? *but he will not hear thee. Shall it be to these Virgins? but they also shall impart none of their Oyl unto thee. Shalt thou call upon thy Father or thy Grandfather? but none of them is able to release or relieve thee. These things considered, worship and pray to him alone who hath the power to blot out thine Obligation, and quench that flame. Again,* Hom 9. *on the Epistle to the* Colossians, *he tells us, That the Devil envying the honour we have to address our selves to God immediately, hath brought in the service of Angels. The Ancients were generally of opinion, that the Saints are not admitted into Heaven, and a clear sight of God, till the last day; this is confest by* Stapleton, Defens. Eccl. Author. cont. Whitak. l. 1. c. 2. Tertullian, *(says he)* Irenæus, Origen, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Ambrose, Clemens, Romanus, Bernard, &c. *did not assent unto this sentence, which now is defined as a Doctrine of Faith, That the souls of the righteous enjoy the sight of God before the day of Judgment, but did deliver the contrary sentence thereunto. And if so, they could not be of opinion, by* Bellarmine's *own Concessions, that men on earth should invocate them, as the Romanists now do.* V. Origen. in Rom. l. 2. p. 472. Aug. Tom. 8. in Psal. 36.

Seeing then the Scripture, and the ancient Fathers, are no Friends to this Popish Invocation now in question; I am the less concerned about those other reasons which they sometimes urge in behalf of it. Nevertheless I shall consider those that are most considerable, that seem to have the greatest force in them.

Arg. 1. They argue from the lawfulness of desiring the Prayers of just men here on Earth: this is, they say, our daily practice; nothing is more ordinary than to intreat the Prayers one of another: the Apostle writes to the *Romans*, *Ephesians*, *Colossians*, and desires to be assisted by their Prayers. Now if we may intreat the Prayers and Intercessions of just men on Earth, much more then of just men made perfect in Heaven.

Answ. 1. There is not the same reason for both; because the former is required and warranted by the Word of God, and not the latter. Again, the living may be made acquainted with our desires and wants, and not the dead; we have no way of informing them, or communicating our minds to them: they that suppose it, cannot agree (as was said before) about the way and manner of it. Other reasons may be assigned why living Christians should pray one for another, which won't hold in this case. Hereby they are made sensible of each others wants, sufferings and infirmities; as also there is an increase of mutual and brotherly love, which is a necessary bond amongst Christians. But this is not all.

2. There is a vast disparity betwixt the Papists praying to the Saints in Heaven, and the Protestants desiring of the Prayers of just men here on Earth. This may easily be discerned by any that have not a mind to deceive, or to be deceived. When we desire others to pray with or for us, we don't make them the Object of Prayer and religious Invocation; nor do we reckon them as our Mediators, but as our fellow-suiters. See this in an instance. One man goes to his Minister, or godly Neighbour, and tells him his condition, and then desires him that he would strive together with him earnestly in Prayer to God for him,

him, that he may be ſupplied in the things that he ſtands in need of. Another applies himſelf to one that is in Heaven, (or it may be that he ſuppoſeth to be there) and with great devotion he proſtrates himſelf before him, (or it may be his Image) and then he prays, *Oh bleſſed St.* Francis *or St.* Dominick, *Look down upon thy poor Supplicant, take pity on me, a miſerable ſinner; I commend my body and ſoul to thee; aſſiſt me by thy merits, fill me with thy graces, bring me to everlaſting happineſs. Save me now and in the hour of death,* &c. I would fain know whether the practice of theſe two be one and the ſame: nay, whether there be any proportion or likeneſs betwixt the action of the one, and of the other. Take the holieſt man now living in the world, (and if you believe the Church of *Rome*, there be ſome that have holineſs enough, and to ſpare) and let this man have ſome of that religious Worſhip that is defer'd to their female (not to ſay their fictitious) Saints; as for inſtance, *St. Katharine, St. Margaret, St. Brigit, St. Barbara, St. Urſula*, or the like: that is to ſay, let a Temple be built, and an Altar erected to him, let his Image be ſet up, and the people enjoined to fall down before it, burn Incenſe to it, *&c.* let Vows and Supplications be made to him, and that in ſeveral places, and in the uſual forms: I ſay, let this, or ſomething like it, be done to the holieſt man living, and I am confident the Papiſts, yea the Pope and all his Cardinals would with one mouth condemn it, and ſay it were blame-worthy and abominable.

Arg. 2. This practice argues reverence and humility; (r) 'tis pride and arrogance to make our addreſſes to God immediately. Here we ſeek to the King by the mediation of his Courtiers; much rather ſhould we go to God by the interceſſion of thoſe that are his Favourites in Heaven.

(r) *Precatio Dei per invocationem Sanctorum arguit majorem humilitatem, ſicut videre eſt in Centurione.* Salm. in 1 Tim. 2. Diſput. 7. Sect. ult.

Anſw. This pretence or ſhew of humility ſeems by that Text in *Col.* 2. 18. to have a main hand in the firſt introducing of Angel-Worſhip. And of this opinion is an ancient Writer, (ſ) who ſays, *They adviſed of old the Invocation of Angels upon this pretence, that the God of all things was inviſible and inacceſſible, and that it was fit we ſhould procure his favour by the means or mediation of Angels.* It was by this very Argument that the Gentiles of old defended their *Dæmon*-Worſhip. This I have already hinted, and an ancient Father doth plainly aſſert it, (t) *That the Heathen Idolaters, to cover the ſhame of their neglecting of God, were wont to uſe this miſerable excuſe, that by theſe they might go to God, as by Officers we go to the King.*

(ſ) Προσήκει διὰ τῆς ἀγγέλων τιμῆς θείαν δυμφέρειαν πραγματεύεσθαι. Theodor. in Coloſſ. 2.

(t) *Solent tamen pudorem paſſi neglecti Dei miſera uti excuſatione, dicentes per iſtos poſſe ire ad Deum, ſicut per Comites pervenitur ad Regem.* Ambroſ. in c. 1. ad Roman.

But the ſame Author proceeds to diſcover the vanity of this pretence.

(u) *Age, nunquid tam demens est aliquis, aut salutis suæ immemor, ut honorificentiam Regis vindicet comiti? cum de hac re si qui etiam tractare fuerint inventi, jure ut rei damnentur Majestatis. Et isti se non putant reos qui honorem nominis Dei deserunt Creaturæ, & relicto domino conservos adorant, quasi sit aliquid plus quod servetur Deo. Nam & ideo ad Regem per Tribunos aut comites itur, quia homo utique est Rex, & nescit quibus debeat rempub. credere. Ad Deum autem (quem utique nihil latet omnium enim merita novit) suffragatore non opus est, sed mente devota.* Ambros. ibid.

I shall give you his own words: (u) *Go to,* (saith he) *is there any man so mad or unmindful of his Salvation, as to give the Kings honour to an Officer? Whereas if any shall be found but to treat of such a matter, they are justly condemned as guilty of a great offence against the King. And yet these men think themselves not guilty, who give the honour of God's Name to a Creature, and leaving the Lord, adore their fellow-servants, as though there were any thing more that could be reserved to God. For therefore do men go to the King by Tribunes or Officers, because the King is but a man, and knoweth not to whom he may commit the state of the Commonwealth. But to procure the favour of God, (from whom nothing is hid, and who knows the works of all men) we need no Spokes-man, but a devout mind.*

When (says Chrysostom) *thou hast need to sue unto men, thou art forced first to deal with Door-keepers, and to intreat Parasytes and Flatterers, and go a long way about; ὁ δὲ τῷ Θεῷ ἐδὲν τοιοῦτον ἔστιν,* &c. *But with God there is no such matter; without an Intercessor he is intreated; without money, without cost he yieldeth to thy prayer. It sufficeth only that thou cry in thine heart, and bring tears with thee, and entring in straightways thou mayst draw him unto thee.* Serm. 7. de Pœnitent. Tom. 6. p. 802. Edit. Savil. *And in another place,* Οὐκ γυναικὸς Φιλοσοφίαν, &c. *Mark,* says he, *the Philosophy or wisdom of the woman of* Canaan, *she intreateth not* James, *she beseecheth not* John, *neither doth she come to* Peter; *but brake the whole company of them, saying, I have no need of a Mediator; but taking repentance with me for a Spokes-man, I come to the Fountain it self. For this cause did he take flesh, that I might take the boldness to speak to him. I have no need of a Mediator; have thou mercy upon me.* In dimissun. Chanaan, Tom. 5. p. 195. Edit. Savil. *Again, in his fifth Sermon on the eighth of* Matth. *God* (saith he) *will not grant us so much of his grace at the request of them which pray for us, as when we our selves pray unto him. ——— In praying for our selves we do more with God than when others pray for us. ——— He put off the* Canaanitish *woman when his Disciples prayed for her, and heard her when she her self prayed, and said,* Be it unto thee as thou wilt.

I shall conclude my Answer to this Plea of the Romanists, by proposing one thing to their consideration. Suppose a * King should grant to all his Subjects, the poor as well as the rich, free access to him, promising a redress of all their grievances upon the only mediation of the Prince his Son; and the Prince again should by open Proclamation invite all freely to come to him, and proffer himself to be their Mediator, promising he will not in any wise reject the meanest of them. Would it be arrogance in any to accept of this offer? nay, would it not be the highest presumption to take another course? to apply to the King by the mediation of this or the other Courtier? The case is the same here. But I hasten to the third and last Argument.

* *Si rex constituerit certum intercessorem non volet ad se causas per alios deferri. Ita cum Christus sit constitutus Pontifex & Intercessor cur quærimus alios.* V. Augustin. l. 8. de Civitate Dei.

Pharisaica superbia est vel nostra vel aliorum hominum merita Deo in oratione opponere. Chemnic.

Arg. 3. The

Arg. 3. The third Argument is taken from the ſucceſs of ſuch Prayers. This is inſiſted on by a late Author, and he calls it, (w) *A convincing Argument. Certain it is* (ſaith he) *that many and great Miracles have been wrought by God upon Addreſſes made to the Saints, that thoſe who call upon them are heard, and obtain what they deſire.* He gives ſeveral inſtances, and if the Reader pleaſe, I'll tranſcribe one of them: 'tis a ſtory of what happened to one St. *John Damaſcen*, about the year 728. "He is known "(ſaith he) to have been a ſtout Aſſertor of "the Veneration of holy Images; and when "the Emperour *Leo Iſauricus* raiſed a Perſecu- "tion (ſo he calls it) for that cauſe, he wrote divers learned Epiſtles "to confirm the faithful in the Tradition of the Church. He was then "at *Damaſcus*, where the Prince of the *Saracens* kept his Court, and "highly in the favour of that Prince for his Wiſdom and Learning. "The Emperour *Leo*, not knowing otherwiſe how to execute his fury "againſt him, cauſes a Letter to be forged, as from *Damaſcen* to him, "and to be tranſcribed by one who could exactly imitate his hand: "the Contents whereof were to invite him to paſs that way with his "Army, with promiſe to deliver the City into his hands. This Letter "the Emperour (as out of friendſhip to an Ally, and deteſtation of "the Treachery) ſent to the Prince of the *Saracens*; who no ſooner "ſaw and read it, but in a brutiſh paſſion commanded the right hand "of *Damaſcen* (which he ſuppoſed had writ it) to be cut off. *Dictum "Factum*, a Word and a Blow; his hand was ſtruck off, and hung up "in the Market-place till Evening, when upon petition that he might "have leave to bury it, it was commanded to be given him. He takes "the hand, and in ſtead of laying it in the ground, joins it to his Arm, "and proſtrating himſelf before an Image of our Bleſſed Lady, which "he kept in his Oratory, humbly beſought her interceſſion, for the re- "ſtoring of his hand, that he might imploy it in ſetting forth her Son's "praiſes, and hers. This done, ſleep ſeized on him, and he beheld "the Image of the Bleſſed Virgin looking upon him with a pleaſing "aſpect, and telling him that his hand was reſtored. Which when he "awaked he found to be true, and a ſmall circle or mark only remain- "ing in the place where it had been cut off, to teſtifie the truth of the "Miracle. This is recorded, it ſeems, by *John* Patriarch of *Jeruſalem*, in the Life of this St. *John Damaſcen*.

(w) Cathol. no Idolat. p. 420, 424, 425. *Puella quædam obſeſſa, adducta fuit ad Capellam B. V. in antiqua Oetingen ubi cum litania cantaretur, & invocaretur miſerecordia auxilium & liberatio Dei Patris, Filii & S. S. Diabolus nihil fuit motus. Cum vero Lauret. Litania de B. Maria inchoaretur tum demum Satanas cœpit in obſeſſa turbari, clamare & furire. Mox vero Caniſius præſes, imagine B. Mariæ arrepta impoſuit capiti puellæ obſeſſæ, & tum Diab. cœpit exclamare. Ah mulier quid me calcas & caput meum conteris, &c.* Narratio Martini Hengerii.

Anſw. Do the Papiſts indeed think that this (and ſuch like pretty ſtories) is a good Foundation for the practice now in queſtion? What if a man ſhould be in doubt of the truth of this, and other relations of this kind? We know of whom it is ſaid, That *his coming is* (x) *after* (x) 2 Theſ. 2. 9.

the

the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders. If I might advise, the Pope should put forth a Bull for the prohibiting, yea for the burning all their Legends and Histories of feigned Miracles: they don't gain, but lose greatly in their reputation by means thereof. Yea, what if I should say the Christian Religion suffers greatly in the World upon this very account? How have Jews and Infidels been hardned in their unbelief of the Gospel, and of the Miracles that Christ and his Apostles wrought for the Confirmation of it? and all by reason of those Fables, and lying Miracles that are obtruded upon the World by those of the Church of *Rome*. Repent, O *Rome*; repent in time of the wound that thou hast given to Christianity upon the score of these Fables and Forgeries.

(y) The Apostasie of the Latter Times.

'Tis worth our notice, and may serve as a farther Answer to this Plea, what Mr. *Mede* offers (y) in his Treatise before-cited, *That the Gentiles Dæmon-worship did enter into the World after the same manner, it was first insinuated, and afterwards established by Signs and Wonders of the very self same kind; so that the Idolatry of Saint-worship is in this respect also a true counterfeit of their Idolatry of Dæmons.* He brings in *Chrysostom* affirming that the *Dæmons* of the Gentiles wrought Miracles for the Confirmation of Paganism, and the Pagan Idolatry. *They often-times by their skill cured Diseases, and restored to health those that were sick. What,* (says he) *should we partake therefore with them in their impiety? God forbid.* He cites *Eusebius* also to this purpose:

Quærite si vera est Divinitas Christi; si est ea, qua cognita, ad bonum quis reformetur sequitur ut falsa renuncietur, comperta imprimis illa omni ratione, quæ delitescens sub nominibus & imaginibus mortuorum, quibusdam signis & miraculis, & oraculis, fidem divinitatis operatur. Tertul. Apol. ad Gent. cap. 21. in fine.

"When (says he) those wicked Spirits (meaning those that were worshipped under the "names of *Dæmons*) saw mankind brought off "to a deifying of the Dead, they insinuated "themselves, and helpt forward their errour, "by causing motions in those Statues, which "were consecrated to the Honour of the De"ceased, as also by Oracles and curing of "Diseases: by means of which the superstitious and credulous people "took them to be some Heavenly Powers, and gods indeed; some"times to be the Souls of their deified Worthies. And thus (saith he) "the Earth-Neighbouring *Dæmons*, which are the Princes of the Air, "those Spiritualities of wickedness, and Ring-leaders of all evil, were "on all hands accounted for great gods. And farther he adds, That "the Memory of deceased Worthies was celebrated with great service, "the feature of whose Bodies the dedicated Images in every City seem'd "to represent, but their Souls the wicked *Dæmons* counterfeited by "working many wonders. Let me shut up this answer with the saying of a laborious and learned person, his words are these: (a) *If it be ob-*

(a) Willet. in his Synop. Papismi, p. 437. *Ex solis miraculis, sine testimoniis verbi Dei, non posse ullum dogma probari nec hoc titulo debere recipi ipsa Scrip. diserte testatur,* Deut. 15 Chemnic. Exam. *Cecilius* saith of the *Dæmons* of the Heathens, *Dant cautelam periculi, morbis Medelam, opem miseris, solatium calamitatibus, laboribus levamentum.* Minut. p. 7.

jected,

jected, That many have prayed to the Saints, and particularly to the Virgin Mary, *and have obtained their requests, and therefore such prayers are available. We answer, That is no good Argument which is taken from the event: for so* Livy *writeth, that* Romulus *prayed to* Jupiter, *that he would stay the flight of the* Romans, *that he might keep off the* Sabines, *and it was effected.* Pliny *also reporteth, that one* Helpis *seeing a rampant Lion come against him, prayed to* Bacchus, *and was delivered. Like as the praying to Heathen gods is not justified by the subsequent effects, no more is the invocating of Saints*, &c.

Come we now to a conclusion. I desire in the close of all that these three particulars may be considered.

1. That this Discourse doth not destroy that Communion of Saints which is the common belief of all Christians. It is levell'd against the Invocation, not against the Communion of Saints. *Jerusalem* is sometimes put for the Church Militant on Earth, and sometimes for the Church Triumphant in Heaven, to shew that both make but one City of God. The Church below, and the Church above, are two parts of one and the same Catholick Church, whence it is that those who are sanctified, and called on Earth, are said to be come to the spirits of just men made perfect in Heaven. So the Apostle tells the *Hebrews*, that they are brought by the Gospel into a blessed Society, *with God the Judge of all, with Jesus Christ the Mediator of the new Covenant, with an innumerable company of Angels, and with the spirits of just men made perfect.* Both those that are already made perfect, and those that still abide in a state of imperfection, are fellow-Citizens, (as he elsewhere phraseth it) and have mutual fellowship or communion one with another. They have mutual relation to one Father, and Children of the same Father have mutual fellowship amongst themselves: they have mutual union with one Head, and Members of the same body have mutual communion one with another: they have their animation by one and the same Spirit, as all the Members are animated by one and the same Soul: that Spirit which dwells in the Saints on Earth, doth bear them company into Heaven.

If it be demanded wherein this Communion consisteth which is between the Saints above, and the Saints below? I answer, It consists mainly in mutual affections and communications one to another. The Saints in Heaven rejoice at God's preservation of his Church on Earth; that so many of their brethren and fellow-servants are daily fitted for Heaven, and translated thither, whereby their blessed Society is increased. The Saints above may also pray and intercede for those below: for though the Papists confound these two, (as they do other things) to wit, the Intercession and the Invocation of Saints, yet there is a wide difference betwixt them: (b) And there be who allow them to pray for us, who yet will not admit of our praying unto them. (See *Rev.* 6. 10.) But then they say that this Intercession of theirs is for the

(b) *They are very different questions, whether the Saints pray for us, and whether we must pray to them? It is one thing to know what the Saints do in Heaven, and another thing to know what we must do on Earth.* P. du Moulin.

Church in general, and not for this or that Member in particular, whose case or person it's most likely is not known to them. On the other side, the Saints on Earth they pray for the Resurrection of the Bodies of the Saints in Heaven, that in Body as well as in Spirit they may be perfected and glorified. Yea, this is one sense of that Petition in the Lords Prayer, *Thy Kingdom come.* — They likewise praise God for the rest they enjoy in Heaven, that they are delivered from this valley of tears and trouble. They also groan, and that earnestly, to be glorified with them, and to be translated into their condition and company. Above all, they set them before them as their examples, walking in their godly steps; *being followers of them as they have been followers of that which is good.* Though they don't invocate them, yet they study to imitate them, which is the highest honour they can put upon them. This is that which the Apostle requires in the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, when he bids us, *to be followers of them who through faith and patience inherit the promises.*

2. This Discourse serves to excite Christians to be much in calling on him in whom they believe. To be frequent in praying to God in the Name of Jesus Christ. *Take* (says James) *the Prophets for an example of patience, and of suffering affliction.* Take, I say, the Papists for an example of prayer, (such as it is) and unwearied devotion. It was the advice of a good man to his friend, that he would spend as much time every day in prayer and meditating, as he did in eating and drinking. It were well if we spent as many hours every day in the service and worship of God, as some of them do in serving and worshipping the Saints We may receive instruction from Oxen and Asses, and other bruit Creatures, and so we may from the blind Papists. *Go to the Ant, thou Sluggard*; and go to the Papist, thou slothful Christian: He hath his Canonical and stated hours for his devotion, he's diligent in turning over his Beads, in pattering over his *Pater Nosters* and *Ave Maries*, and will admit of no avocation. How then art thou to be reproved, who neglectest prayer to God from day to day? How many prayerless families and persons are there in this Nation? Christ says, *The Ninevites shall rise up in the Judgment against the Jews*, and the Papists will rise up in the Judgment against many Protestants, *and condemn them.* The charge of *Eliphaz* against *Job* will lie more rightly against many a one in the midst of us; you'll find it in *Job* 15. 4. he says there, *Thou castest off fear, and restrainest prayer before God.* (c) Some read the words thus, Thou multipliest prayer. The word notes (as one observes) the cutting or dividing a thing into small pieces or portions, which is indeed to multiply it. And 'tis as if he should have said, Thou dost mince thy prayers, and cut them out into many small shreads, as if thou didst hope to be heard for thy much speaking. Such were the Devotions of the Pharisees of old, and such are the Devotions of the Papists their Successors, to this day. Their *Collects* and *Litanies* are full

(c) *Arguitur Job quod multiloquio vel battologia usus est.* Bold V. Caryl in locum.

full of *vain Repetitions*, the same things over and over again. But take the words as they are in our Translation, *Thou restrainest prayer before God*; and then they note either a total forbearing, or a partial diminishing of the duty: some don't pray at all, others pray but seldom; both come under this reproof of restraining prayer. Remember who commands you, to *pray always*, and to *pray without ceasing*. Resolve, Reader, whoever thou art, upon more frequency and fervency in this duty. Let an hour, or more, every day be set apart for secret prayer; and be sure, as *Elias* did, *(d) to pray in prayer*. The Papists and others say prayers, but do thou pray in prayer to God. 'Tis recorded of *(e) Luther* that he prayed every day three hours, *(easque ad studia aptissimas)* and that when he was most fit for such a service: *Go thou and do likewise.*

(d) προσευχῇ προσεύξατο. James 5. 17.

(e) V. Vit. Theod. in vita ejus *Judge* Cooke *advised to four hours in a day for this exercise.*

Sex horas somno, totidem dei legibus æquis, quatuor orabis, Epulisque duas; Quod superest sacris ultro largire camænis. King *Alfred* divided every day into three parts, he allowed eight hours to his devotion, eight to his employment, and eight to his sleep and refection.

3. This Discourse may have this farther fruit, to beget a dislike, yea a detestation of Popery. One would wonder that a man in his right senses should ever become a Papist. Their opinions many of them are not only unscriptural, but irrational, a man must offer violence to his reason if he complies with them. I might give many instances, consider these two; the one is praying for the Dead, the other is praying to the Dead. We cannot help the Dead by praying for them, nor can they hear us when we pray unto them. Yea, the Popish Religion is not only ridiculous, but Idolatrous. There is a fivefold Idolatry which we charge upon the Church of *Rome*. 1. The worshipping of the *Cross*. 2. The worshipping of *Images*. 3. The worshipping of *Relicks*. 4. The worshipping of the *Elements* in the *Eucharist*. 5. The worshipping of *Saints and Angels*. Well may she be called the *Whore of Babylon*, yea that *great Whore, and the Mother of Fornications, and Abominations of the Earth*. The Church of the Jews did not forsake the true God altogether, only she would worship him in *Calves and Images*, and how often for this reason is she called a *Whore*, and an *abominable Harlot?* The Church of *Rome* is a worser Strumpet than ever she was; *a deep Ditch* she is, may none amongst us be so *far abhorred of the Lord as to fall into it*. Dearly beloved Country-men, *Flee from Idolatry: this the abominable thing that God hateth*. Popish Idolatry is as bad or worse than Paganish. I shall conclude this Sermon as the Apostle *John* doth his first Epistle, *Little Children, keep your selves from Idols*. Amen.

SERMON XVI.

Mr Thomas Lye

No Works of Supererogation.

Luke 17. 10. *So likewise ye, when ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants, we have done that which was our duty to do.*

Coherence.

THe Truth that at this time lies before me, both to prove and improve, is this, **That there are not any Works of Supererogation.** On that account I have pitcht on the words read, which are an *Apodosis*, or *Epiphonema*, the Inference or *Conclusion* which our Lord Jesus draws from his preceding Parable.

The Parable begins Verse 7. *Which of you, having a servant plowing, or feeding cattel, will say unto him by and by when he is come from the field, Go, and sit down to meat?* Vers. 8. *And will not rather say unto him, Make ready wherewith I may sup, and gird thy self, and serve me till I have eaten and drunken.* Vers. 9. *Doth he thank that servant because he did the things that were commanded him? I trow not.* Vers. 10. *So likewise ye, when ye shall,* &c.

Paraphrase.

A. δοῦλος, q. δεῖλος, a δέω ligo, mancipium, *a bond-slave.* Servus a servando, servi primum e captivis facti sunt ab iis, a quibus jure belli eos occidi liceret. Vossius. δοῦλος ejus correlatum, δεσπότης; oppositum, ἐλεύθερος, ἐκ ἔνι δοῦλος ἐδὲ ἐλεύθερος, Gal. 3. 28.

Doth he thank *that servant?* τῷ δούλῳ ἐκείνῳ; or if you will, that *captive-slave*, (who is wholly at his foot and dispose) as if forsooth by his obedience he had done his Master a free kindness and favour, to which he was not obliged? Hath that *Vassal* in strictness of justice *obliged* his Master? and is his Master *bound* to look upon himself as obliged to return his Vassal thanks, and to *reward* him for doing the things that were commanded him? *I trow not,* οἶμαι δοκῶ, I think, suppose, judge not. Neither the person nor the service do in truth *deserve or merit* any thing, no not so much as *thanks*, nor can in justice claim it. The *Ransomed Vassal* his All, his Life, Spirits, Strength, Service; All that he is, hath, can do, suffer, are *his Masters*, not his own, and therefore wholly and solely at his absolute dispose and command. *Doth he then thank that servant? I trow not.* True indeed, though the great God owes us no thanks, yet *in infinite grace* he is pleased so far to *stoop* beneath himself, as *to give us*

thanks

thanks for our obedience, and to beſpeak us in ſuch a *condeſcending* language, as if indeed he were beholden to us. 1 *Pet.* 2. 19. Τῦτο χάρις, *This is thank-worthy, if a man for conſcience toward God endure grief, ſuffering wrongfully:* i. e. God accounts himſelf hereby *gratified* as it were, and even *beholden* to ſuch ſufferers; this, being the *loweſt* ſubjection, and that being the *higheſt* honour men can yield unto their Maker. God will thank ſuch. Nay more, look into that amazing Scripture, *Luke* 12. 36, 37. and read it, if you can without an extaſie: *If a man ſerves, and his Lord comes and finds him watching too, and intent upon his work, what will his Lord do? he will gird himſelf, and ſerve him. O ſtupenda condeſcenſio! O ſtupenda dignatio!* ſays one on the place. But know, though theſe two Parables ſeem parallel, their *ſcope* vaſtly differs. What a diligent Servant may *humbly expect* from his bountiful Lord is *one thing, viz.* That his labour ſhall not be in * vain, or unprofitable, but plentifully rewarded. That's the ſcope of *Luke* 12. And what the moſt diligent Slave can *juſtly challenge* from his abſolute Lord and Patron *is another*, which is the grand ſcope of the Text. Doth he deſerve, or may he juſtly challenge any the leaſt reward, yea but ſo much as *bare thanks?* I trow not. *So likewiſe ye, &c.*

* 1 Cor. 15 58.

When ye ſhall have done all thoſe things which are commanded you, (a) Ὅταν ποιήσητε. The learned *Glaſſius* obſerves, that in theſe words our Saviour doth not inſinuate that any man arrives at that *ſinleſs* perfection in this life, as to do all thoſe things which God commands: for how much ſoever we have done, it will appear upon a juſt balance of account, that we have done *leſs* than we ought, and are much *ſhort* of our duty. But Chriſt ſpeaks here *conditionally*, and *ſuppoſes* only what he doth not *aſſert* or grant, q. d. *if it were poſſible* for them to do all things that were (*b*) commanded by God in his holy Word, *to do all that good that God requires*, Micah 6. 8. to walk exactly *according to that good, accceptable and perfect will of God*, Rom. 12. 2. Heb. 13. 21. All thoſe good things, I ſay, which God preſcribes in his Word, and *not ſuch as fond men* deviſe, either out of *blind Zeal*, or upon pretence of good intention, *without the warrant* of the Word, Matth. 15. 9. Iſai. 29. 13. 1 Pet. 1. 18. Rom. 10. 2. Joh. 16. 2. 1 Sam. 15. 21, to 24.

(a) Ὅταν, *particula temporis indeterminati pro ſi. Glaſſ. gram. Sacr. l. 3. Tract. 7. Can. 5.*

(b) Πάντα τὰ διατεταγμένα ὑμῖν, *omnia, quæ præcepta, edicta, injuncta, ſancita ſunt vobis, a* τάττω *ordino. actum inſtruo..*

Suppoſing then that you have *done* all theſe things, (*c*) ποιήσητε, and that with utmoſt *Art and Induſtry*, as a man would do a *curious piece of Work*, which he intends to expoſe as his *Maſterpiece* to the moſt curious view of all Obſervers,----- Well, and what then? *Then ſay ye, We are unprofitable ſervants.* When God lookt back on the Works of his hands, and ſaw every thing that he had made, he did, and might moſt juſtly ſay, *Behold, it is very good*, Gen. 1. 31. But as for you, when ye have done your utmoſt, ſay ye, *We are unprofitable ſervants.*--- Yes, ſay the Papiſts, *ſay ſo indeed*, but this is only out of *humility* and *modeſty*, for ye are not really unprofitable. To whom we give this ſhort reply.

(c) Ποιέω, *edo. præſto, proprie ſignif. rem. aliquam certis quibuſdam orno.* ποῖος *qualis.-- facio a* φάω *luceo, qui rem facit, dat eam lucis, atque ut conſpiciatur, facit Voſſius*, Joh. 8. 34. & 3. 21.

reply. Christ doth not hear teach his Disciples the art of *modest* lying, and that to God himself, to say one thing, and to think another. No, without question we are to say so, and that from the *heart*, and in saying so, we speak the truth, and nothing but the truth. *We are indeed unprofitable servants*, such as cannot *merit* the least good at the hand of God by our best obedience.

(d) ἀχρεῖοι, *inutiles, ab a priv. & χρεία usus, utiles, commodum.*

(e) אלח, *Ab putidus. fœtidus fuit,* Job 15. 16.

(f) Τὸν ἀχρεῖον δοῦλον ἐκβάλλετε.

(d) *Unprofitable*, ἀχρεῖοι. 'Tis well observed by some *Criticks*, that this word is of the same import with that *Rom.* 3. 12. they are become *unprofitable*, ἠχρεώθησαν, so the Sept. render *Psal.* 14. 3. & 53. 3. The word in the Original (e) נאלחך, They are become *abominable*, *putidi facti sunt*; so far from being profitable, that they rather *stink* in God's Nostrils. Nay farther, 'tis the same word that is given to that wicked and slothful servant that was cast out into outer darkness. *Cast out that* (f) *unprofitable servant*, Mat. 25. 36. To shew us, saith one, what our merit is, if God should be severe, *Psal.* 143. 2.

In the *last* place, our Saviour subjoins the reason why he would have us heartily to acknowledge our selves unprofitable servants, and 'tis this, *Because if we had*, or could have *done all those things*, &c. we had then *done but that which we ought to do*; that, and that only, that, and no more than was our (g) duty to do, and on that account the Lord by a just right might exact and challenge it at our hands. We owe all obedience possible to *God as our Creator*, Psal. 100. 2, 3. & 33. 8, 9. The highest obedience is our *debt*, and it is no matter of merit to pay a man's debts. How good soever any man is, he is no *better* than he should be; and what good soever any man hath *done*, he hath done no more than was his *duty* to do both to God and man. On this account, saith our Saviour, if you could and should do all those things, *&c.*

(g) Ὁ ὀφείλομεν, αὐ ὀφείλω, debeo, ære alieno obstrictus sum oportet me.

From the words thus opened, I infer these *two* Conclusions.

1. *They, who in their Obedience attain to the greatest heighth which is possible in this life, fall short of much which in duty they are bound to do.*

2. *Were it possible for the best of men perfectly to keep the Law of God, yet even these supposed perfect ones cannot in the least oblige God, or merit any thing from the hand of his justice.*

These two Propositions *solidly* fixt, and *fitly* discharged, may through a *smile* from Heaven prove effectual for the battering down of one of the topmost *Pinacles* of the *Romish Babel*, *viz.* their proud Doctrine of *Supererogation.*

1 *Conclusion.* First of the first. *They, who in their Obedience attain to the greatest heighth which is possible in this life, fall short of much which in duty they are bound to do.*

Quest. 1. But what is every man in this life in duty *bound* to do?

Answ.

Answ. Every man in this life is *bound to full conformity, in the whole man, to the righteous Law of God, and to entire, exact and perpetual obedience thereunto.* The Law of the Lord is *perfect*, Psal. 19. 7. and requires the highest *perfection* both of *parts* and *degrees*; and that

1. *In the frame and disposition of the whole man, soul and body.* It reaches all the faculties, motions and operations of the *inward*, as well as the *words*, *works* and *gestures* of the outward. Man, as God's Creature, is bound to love *the Lord his God with all his heart, soul, mind, might, and strength*, Deut. 16. 5. Mat. 27. 37, to 41. Luke 10. 26,27. The *first bublings* of rash anger, are no less forbidden by this *Royal* Law, than *cruel Murther*, Mat. 5. 21, 22. A *Lust peeping out* of the eye, is no less a violation of this *Spiritual* Law, than an *unclean* act, Vers. 27, 28.

2. *In the performance of all those duties of holiness and righteousness which he oweth to God and man.* Israel must *hear all God's Commandments*, Statutes and Judgments, that they might learn, and keep, and do them, Deut. 5. 1, 2, 3, 31, 33. He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good, truly and acceptably good; and *what doth the Lord thy God require of thee?* Surely something, that in the *balance of the Sanctuary down weighs* thousands of Rams, and ten thousands of Rivers of Oyl, nay, is *more acceptable* than the Idolatrous sacrificing of a *first-born* Son, namely, *To do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God*, Mic. 6. 6, 7, 8. Holy Paul writes after this *Copy*, but could not reach it; 'twas his *exercise and endeavour*, though not his *attainment*, to get and keep *a good Conscience void of offence*, both towards God, and towards man, *Acts* 24. 16.

3. *In this universal performance of all obedience, the Law requires the utmost perfection in every duty, and forbids the least degree of every sin.* Who so shall keep the whole Law, and *yet offend in one point*, i. e. wil- James 2. 10. ingly, constantly, and with allowance from Conscience, though but in the *least tittle*, *he is guilty of all*, i. e. is liable to the same punishment, stands upon no better terms of hope and acceptance with God, than if he had done nothing.

Object. But what's all this to Believers? *They are not under the Law, but under Grace*, Rom. 6. 14.

Answ. 1. True Believers are not under the Law *as a Covenant of Works*, so as to be thereby either *justified*, Gal. 2. 16. Act. 13. 39. or *condemned*, Rom. 8. 1. Gal. 3. 13.

2. But yet they are under the *Conduct* of the Law, *viz.* as it is a *Rule of Life*, *informing* them of the Will of God, and their Duty, and both at once *direct and bind them* to walk accordingly. See what high apprehensions *Paul* had of this Law, *The Law is holy, and the Commandment is holy, just and good*, Rom. 7. 12. His *dear affection* to it, *I delight in the Law of God after the inner man*, Vers. 22. His *faithful observance* of it, *With the mind I my self serve the Law of God*, Vers. 25.

Copies

Copies out a great part of it, and presents it as *a Rule to the Romans* to walk by, *Rom.* 13. 7, 8, 9. and to other Churches, 1 *Cor.* 7. 19. *Gal.* 5. 14. *Ephes.* 6. 2, 3. *James* calls it *A Royal Law*, the Law of God, the King of Kings, and Jesus Christ the King of Saints. It hath a *Kingly* Author, requires *Noble* Work, gives *Royal* Wages, a Law of Liberty, which if ye shall fulfil, if ye have respect to the whole duty and compass thereof, *ye shall do well*, and but well, *Jam.* 1. 25. & 2. 8. Thus the *Beloved* Disciple backs the Authority of the Law, 1 *John* 2. 3, 4, 7, 8.

Object. But hath not the Lord Jesus in the Gospel *dissolved this Obligation?*

Answ. Yea, so *far* is Christ in the Gospel *from dissolving*, that he much *ratifies* and *strengthens* this Obligation, *Matth.* 5. 17, 18, 19. *I came not to destroy, but to fulfil*; in this Chapter clearly *expounds it*, elsewhere most strictly *enjoins* it, *Matth.* 22. 37, to 44. *Luke* 10. 26, 27. *Mark* 12. 33. *Paul* goes deep in the case, and rejects the thought of it with the deepest aversation, *Rom.* 3. 31. Do we then *make void the Law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the Law.*

Thus you have heard what every man in this life is in duty bound to do: namely, *perfectly*, intirely, *exactly*, perpetually to keep the Commandments of God: That's his duty. In the next place, let us speak to his *Ability*, or rather *utter impotency* to perform this duty.

2. *They who in their Obedience attain to the greatest heighth which is possible in this life, fall short of much which in duty they are bound to do.*

Since the fall of the *first Adam*, our common Head and Representative, *no meer man* descending from him by *ordinary* Generation, in *this* life ever was, is, or *shall* be *able*, either by himself, or by any strength of Grace received, *perfectly to keep the Commandments of God*, but doth *daily* break them in *thought*, word and deed.

1. *Since* Adam's *fall*.---- True indeed, the *first Adam* in his estate of *innocency* had a power, *personally* and *perfectly*, to keep the whole Law of God; but *not since*, neither he, nor any that naturally spring from his loins. 'Twas the dream of the old *Pelagians*, that man was so little *bruised and impaired by* Adam's *fall*, that even still by the meer power of Nature he could perfectly keep the whole Law. If so, what means the Apostle, *Rom.* 5. 12, 17, 18, 19. 1 *Cor.* 15. 21, 22. By *Adam's* sin were all made unrighteous, subject to death, *judgment*, condemnation; and therefore such unrighteous, *judged*, condemned Creatures as we are all by Nature, can never *perfectly* fulfil a *righteous* Law.

2. *No meer man: none that is a man and no more.*--- No man descending from *Adam* by *ordinary* Generation. True, the only *Mediator* between God and man, the *Man Christ Jesus*, was able perfectly to keep the Commandments of God, and did so. Conceived he was *without sin*, *Luke* 1. 35. *Heb.* 4. 15. Anointed with the Holy Ghost *above measure*,

ſure, Joh. 3. 34. *Holy, harmleſs, undefiled, ſeparate from ſinners*, Heb. 7. 26. Came on purpoſe to *fulfil* the Law, *Mat.* 5. 17. and did *perfectly* fulfil it, *Pſal.* 40. 7, 8. *Heb.* 10. 5, to 11. *Mat.* 3. 17. *John* 17. 4.

But then he was *not a* * *meer man*, He was *God* as well as *man*, *Rom.* 9. 5. *Col.* 2. 9. God *incarnate*, the Eternal *Word* made Fleſh, *John* 1. 14. *manifeſted in the Fleſh*, 1 Tim. 3. 16. But *no meer man.*

* Ἀναμίξαι τῷ θεῷ ἀνθρώπου ἁπλῶς παρέξ τῦ μονοφυῦς δι' ἡμᾶς ἀνθρώπου. Clem. conſtit. l. 2. c. 18.

3. *Not in this life.* We grant, that when the Soul comes to be *inroll'd* and admitted a *Free Denizen* of the Heavenly *Jeruſalem*, ſhe ſhall ſit down *among the Spirits of juſt men made perfect*, Heb. 12. 23. but not till then. When the Saints come *to the meaſure of the ſtature of the fulneſs of Chriſt*, Epheſ. 4. 13. When they come *to ſee God as he is*, and ſhall behold his face in Light and Glory, then, and not till then they ſhall be like him, 1 *John* 3. 2. Then indeed they ſhall ſee God *face to face*, *but here only through a glaſs darkly*, 1 Cor. 13. 12. then preſented *a glorious Church*, not having *ſpot or wrinkle*, Epheſ. 5. 27. But whilſt here, like the *Moon* at Full, not without our ſpots.

4. *Not able perfectly to keep the Commandments of God.*

There is indeed a *twofold perfection* aſcribed to Saints in this life.

1. *A perfection of Juſtification.* Saints are *compleat in Chriſt* their Head and Surety, *Col.* 2. 10. They are *perfectly juſtified, never more liable to Condemnation*, Rom. 8. 1, 33, 34. Heb. 10. 14. Joh. 5. 24.

2. *A perfection of Holineſs or Sanctification*; and this ſo called,

1. *In regard of its eſſential or integral parts.* Thus when we ſee an *Infant*, that hath all the *parts* of a man, ſoul, body, all its members: we ſay, this is a *perfect Child.* Saints, even in this life, have this *begun perfection* of holineſs. They are begun to be ſanctified *in every part*, in ſoul, *body*, ſpirit, *throughout*, though every part be not *throughout* ſanctified, 1 *Theſſ.* 5. 23.

2. *In regard of deſires, intendments, aims at, and endeavours after gradual perfection.* They deſire, *ſtudy*, labour to be perfect, *as their Heavenly Father is perfect*, Mat. 5. 48. They *forget that which is behind, and preſs forward towards the mark*, Phil. 3. 12, 13. *Perfection*, which will be their *reward* in Heaven, is their *aim* on Earth; and, as God *accepts* the will for the deed, 2 *Cor.* 8. 12. ſo he *expreſſeth* the deed by the will, and candidly interprets him to be a *perfect man*, who would be perfect, and deſires to have all his imperfections cured.

3. *In reſpect of others; comparatively perfect.* Thus, when one man is *ſickly* and weak, and *another* man is *very ſtrong*, we ſay the ſtrong man hath *perfect health* compared with him that is *ſickly* and weak; and yet the ſtrong man hath *not ſuch perfect health*, but he hath alſo the *principle of ſickneſs* in his body, and ſometime may be ill, and indiſpoſed. Thus *Noah* was *perfect in his Generation*, Gen. 6. 9. *Lot* among the *Sodomites*, *Job* in the Land of *Uz*, *Job* 1. 1. Thus *Saints* in Scripture are ſaid to *be perfect*, when compared with thoſe that were *openly wicked*, or *but openly* holy; ſaid to be *men without ſpot*, compared with thoſe that were

either *all over-spotted* with filthiness, or only *painted* with Godliness. Thus those that were *stronger* in Knowledge and Grace, laid in the *Scale* with those that were weaker; men with babes, 1 *Cor.* 2. 6. *Phil.* 3. 15. *Heb.* 5. 14. are said to be perfect.

4. *In respect of Divine acceptation*, an Evangelical Perfection, a Perfection of *sincerity* and uprightness; such, as love our *Lord Jesus in sincerity*, Ephes. 6. 24. Such, as are not *gilded*, but *golden Christians*; not *painted Sepulchres*, not *whited Walls*; not men *of an heart and an heart.* Thus God to *Abraham*, *Gen.* 17. 1. Walk before me, and *be thou perfect*, or upright. *Aarons* indeed in this, that they carry *Urim and Thummim*, Light, and *Perfection*, or *Uprightness*, engraven on their breasts, *Exod.* 28. 30. on whose *Tombs* you may, with God's approbation and *Testimonial*, write an *Asa*'s *Epitaph*, 2 *Chron.* 15. 17. *Nevertheless*, notwithstanding *Asa* his several *slips*, yet his heart was *perfect with his God* all his days.

5. *In respect of degrees, to which nothing is wanting, nothing can be added to make it more compleat.* When the *Sun* is not only risen, but got to its full *Meridian* and *Zenith*. Thus, when we see *a Child* that was born perfect as to parts, *grown up to mans estate*, so that he shall grow no taller, wax no stronger: this we call *Perfection of degrees*. And thus no Saint in this life, is or can be *perfect*, as to include *all the degrees* of holiness, and to exclude all, *even the least taint* of sin. * And, if there be but the least gradual defect, the Law is not perfectly fulfilled. Now that no man is in this life so perfect, *&c.* appears,

* *Peccatum est, cum non est charitas, quæ esse debet, vel minor est, quam esse debet.* Aug. de perfectione Justitiæ.

1. In this, *That there is not one instance to be given of any one, even the most holy man that ever breathed on God's Earth, that was so holy and perfect as to be freed from having sin in him.* O the *blots* that we find in the *best* of their *Escucheons!* *Noah* at once betrays his *internal* and *external* nakedness. *Abraham*, the Father of the faithful, *equivocates* more than once. *Moses*, that conversed with God *mouth to mouth*, the great *Secretary* of Heaven, is guilty of unbelief, and speaks *unadvisedly* with his lips. What shall I speak of *David*, *Hezekiah*, *Josiah*, those Stars of the *highest* Magnitude? As for *Paul*, even after he had been wrapt up into the third Heavens, hear his groans, his heart-piercing groans, *Rom.* 7. 24. *O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me?* and free confession of his imperfection, *Phil.* 3. 12, 13, 14. *Not that I have already attained, or were already perfect*, &c. As for *Peter* concerning his perfection, read, *but with fear and trembling*, *Matth.* 26. 69. to the end; and when thou hast mingled *tears* with him, draw a finger on his *scar*, and go, and ask *His holy Successor*, that most humble *Servant of Servants* the Pope, whether he, or any of the *Scarlet Robe* under him, dare compare with those truly golden ones for holiness, notwithstanding all their dross? and if not, what becomes of their proud *dream* of gradual Perfection?

Gal. 2. 11, 12.

2. *How many express Scriptures are there, that prove, that no man is perfectly*

perfectly holy in this life? *Solomon* gives us *three*, 1 King. 8. 46. *There is no man that sinneth not.* Eccles. 7. 20. *There is not a just man upon earth that doth good, and sinneth not:* q. d. If you would look for a just one that doth good, and sinneth not, you must look for such an one in *Heaven*, and not upon *Earth*. The learned and judicious Dr. *Manton* hath an excellent Note on this Text, *viz.* The Wise-man doth not say simply, *that sinneth not*, but, *that doth good and sinneth not*; that is, that sinneth not even whilst he is doing good. Our very *Wine* is mixed with *Water*; our *best Silver* with *Dross*. Our softest Lawn hath its List, our *sweetest* Honey its *Wax and sting*. Farther yet, he throws down his *Gantlet*, and proclaims a *Challenge* to all the World, to enter the Lists with him, *Prov.* 20. 9. *Who can say, I have made my heart clean?* Who can? why many can and do, Pharisees, Papists, Quakers. True, many may say so boldly, *proudly*, falsly, but who can say so *truly? I am pure from my sin. If we say that we have no sin, we deceive our selves, and the truth is not in us*, 1 John 1. 8, 10. If we say that we have not sinned, *we make him a lyar, and his Word is not in us.* The Doctrine of the *Catharists* is a lying Doctrine. Even from this Scripture it plainly appears, that that man is *not perfect*, that saith he is perfect, for as much as it saith, that he, that saith so, *is a lyar*, and one that is so far from *growth* and perfection, that the *Truth* it self, the Root of the matter, is not in him. None in this life are absolutely freed and exempted from sinning, *Jam.* 3. 2. *In many things we offend all.* All of us offend in many things, in some things at best. The blessed *Virgin* her self had her slips, *Luke* 2. 49. *John* 2. 3, 4. for which she is taxed by Christ himself. *We offend.* We includes himself, though an Apostle of such eminent holiness, that he was called *the Just*. *Job* 9. 2, 3, 20. *How should man be just with God?* or as *Broughton* reads the words, *How can man be just before the Omnipotent?* Just, *i. e.* by an inherent righteousness before God. *If he will contend with him, he cannot answer him one of a thousand.* Man is not able to maintain his cause, and to hold his plea with an holy God. Hence it is, that that man after God's own heart, wholly *waves* God's *Tribunal* of Justice. *O enter not into Judgment with thy Servant*, Lord; he doth not say, with an Enemy, a *Rebel*, a Traytor, an *Impenitent Sinner*; but *with thy Servant*, one that is *devoted* to thy fear, one that is *consecrated* to thy service, one that is really and indeed *quantus*; *quantus est, totus tuus*, Psal. 143. 2. q. d. Lord, if the holiest, purest, best of men should come and stand before thee in Judgment, or *plead* with thee, they must needs be *cast* in their cause; *If thou, Lord, shouldst mark iniquity, alas, who shall stand?* Psal. 130. 3.

Dr. *Manton* on *James*, p. 351.

Rom. 3 9, to 21, & 23.

Euseb. Eccl. Hist. l. 2. c. 1.

Job 15. 14, 15.

3. *It is utterly impossible in this life perfectly to keep the Commandments of God*, because the best of Saints in this life are but *imperfectly* sanctified. The *principle* of Grace within them, which is the *Fountain*, is but *imperfect*, and therefore the *streams* of obedience can never rise

higher than the Fountain. The *Root* is tainted, and the Sap and Branch, therefore the *Fruit* cannot be perfectly sound. While the Tree is *partly* evil, the Fruit cannot be *wholly* good. As to the great Grace of *Faith*, what great reason hath Christ to say to the best of Saints, as more than once to his Disciples, *O ye of little Faith? Matth.* 6. 30. & 8. 26. & 16. 8. Where is the man of so much brass and impudence, that dares avouch he *loves God* with that degree of intenseness that he ought to do? that he loves God here with as raised, *transcendent*, superlative flame of heart, as ever he shall do, or can hope to do in Heaven? Love always attends on knowledge: I cannot possibly *love* that, which I do not *know*. 'Tis the *eye* that must *affect* the heart. *Ignoti nulla cupido.* Nor can the degree of my *love* exceed the degree of my *knowledge*. It may indeed sink *beneath it*, but never swells *above it*. Now our *knowledge* of God in this life is imperfect; *We know but in part*, we see through a Glass, and that darkly, 1 *Cor.* 13. 9, 12. and therefore cannot love with all the heart, soul, mind, strength. More than this, there are *remnants* of sin abiding in every part of Saints, and perpetual lustings of the flesh against the spirit, *so that they cannot do the things that they would*, Gal. 5. 17. A Law in their members warring against the Law of their minds, and leads them *captive to the Law of sin*, Rom. 7. 18, 23. They have a *Clog* at their heels, *sin that easily besets them*, Heb. 12. 1. *Lusts within them, that war against their souls*, 1 *Pet.* 2. 11. There is indeed in every man, even in the holiest living, *a cursed root of* **bitterness*, which God doth indeed more and more *mortifie*, but not *nullifie* in this life. This like the *Ivy* in the Wall, cut off the Stump, Body, Boughs, Branches of it, yet some strings or other will sprout out again, till the Wall be pluckt down. This, this is that *Colloquintida*, that Death in the Pot, that *Fly-blows* all their Graces, *leavens* all their Comforts, *taints* and *blends* all their Duties. Hence proceed the iniquities of our holy things, *Exod.* 28. 38. This is that, that is able to turn the High Priests *Robes* into *Rags*, his *Incense* into a *Stench*. Hence came the *humble*, but true *complaint* of the Church, *All our righteousnesses*, in themselves, as ours, *are as filthy rags*, Isai. 64. 6. Mark, we do not say as the *Papists* falsly charge us, that all that a Believer doth is sin: but this we say, *a Believer sins*, for the greatest part, *in all he doth*. The *Work* of God's *Spirit upon us*, and the *Motions* of his *Grace* within us, are pure and holy: but yet, as *clean Water* passing through an *unclean* Pipe, receives a *tincture* of that uncleanness; so *sinfulness* cleaves to our *holiest* Actions, we the Instruments being sinful. Needs must the *Musick* be inharmonious, when all the *Strings* of the *Lute* are out of *Tune*.

* *Habitat, sed non regnat; manet, sed non dominatur, evulsum quodammodo, sed non expulsum; dejectum, sed non prorsus ejectum tamen.* Bern. in Psal. 90. Serm. 10.

Mala mea pure mala sunt, & mea sunt: bona autem mea nec pure bona sunt, nec mea sunt. Hugo.

Inference.

Is this a Truth? Is the Moral Law of God so perfect, spiritual, just, and good? Doth it indeed require and exact such *personal*, *perfect*, and *perpetual* Obedience? Must *good*, only good, *all* good, and that in the most *intense* and highest degree, be done, and that from a Divine *Principle*, the Spirit, Faith, Love, in a right *manner*, according to the Divine

vine Word and Will, and to a Divine *End*, the Glory of God? And was there never a Saint yet in the World, that was meer man, that ever did or could *exactly* do what this Law requires, but fell far short of their duty? See here then *the certain downfal of Dagon before the Ark.* Behold here *that arrogant Popish Doctrine of Supererogation, bowing, stooping, falling at the foot of the Truth and Word of God.* Let him that hath an *Ear*, hear and judge. Tell me, if the best of God's Saints, doing their *best*, fall short of *much* which in duty they are *bound* to do, is it possible for a *Popish Shavelling to supererogate*, *i. e.* to do, yea piously, acceptably, and preterpluperfectly to do, far more than God requires? They are not ashamed to tell the World, That 'tis not only *possible*, but *facile* and easie for a true Believer *exactly* to keep the whole Law of God, and not to fail a *tittle*. Alas, *Paul* was a man of *low* attaintments, when he *whines* out his Ἐυ τελαίπωρῳ ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπος. And *David* a *Dwarf* to these *Goliahs*. He indeed stands *wondring and trembling* on the shore of the Ocean, and cries out, *I have seen an end of all perfection, but thy Commandment is exceeding broad:* A great deep, an *unsearchable* gulf, an Ocean without *bank* or *bottom*. But as for them, with their very *Spoon* they'll *lave it*. Alas, 'tis an *easie* leap into the Chair of perfection; that's a *Mark* and White for Souls of a *lower alloy*. But greater Souls are born for greater Exploits. Such *Eagles* as they, scorn to catch at *Flies*, but fly at *Stars*. Nay, 'tis not *Heaven it self*, at least nothing less than the *eleventh* Orb of the *Empyrean* Heavens, can give a proportionable *Treat* to their aspiring Souls. 'Tis for poor penitent Publicans and Sinners, to please themselves in doing; through Christ's strength, what the Lord requires; nothing becomes these Worthies less, than doing *more* than ever entred into God's *heart* to command them. O the *stupendious pride* of *Lucifer*, and of hearts possessed by him. Well, *my Brethren*, I would not be thought to *envy* and pine at their *triumphant* Honour. Only give me leave to conclude this Use, with this *Epiphonema:* viz. *Those that will perform an Obedience that God never commanded, what can they expect less, than an Heaven, that God never created?* But here the *Papist* acts the *Parthian*, and fights flying, *viz.* makes his Objections.

Rom. 7. 24.

Psal. 119. 96.

Vid. vid. Chamier. Tom. 6. l. 20. c. 20.

Object. 1. *Doth God enjoin the Creature that which is impossible?* That were *unjust*, and would highly *intrench* on God's *goodness*.

Sol. This *Arrow* was long since taken out of *Pelagius* his Quiver. To which we reply as *Austin* did: What is *simply* and *absolutely* impossible in it self, God doth not impose upon the Creature. But what apostate Man himself *hath made impossible* to himself, *voluntarily*, and *meerly* by his own default, that the great Lawgiver *may, and doth justly impose:* And this impossibility no way *impeacheth* God's goodness, because the sinner hath *wilfully contracted* and brought it on himself.

If a *Prodigal Spendthrift* hath, by his *Luxury* and *Debauchery*, utterly *disabled* himself to pay his Debts, may not the wronged *Creditors* demand.

demand their due, although the Prodigal cannot pay? What though the Sinner hath loſt his *Power*, ſince this is done wilfully and wickedly? certainly God may juſtly demand his *Right*.

Object. 2. But did not Chriſt come in the fleſh for this end, *That we might be able fully to keep the Law in our own perſons, that the righteouſneſs of the Law might be fulfilled in us?*

Rom. 8. 4. *Sol.* Mark, The Scripture ſaith, *In us*, not *by us*. Chriſt came, that the Righteouſneſs of the Law ſhould be fulfilled *for us*, and *in us*, i. e. *imputatively*, but not *by us perſonally*. The bleſſed Jeſus our Head and Repreſentative, and Surety in his own Perſon whilſt here on Earth, did fully obey the Law, *perfectly* conforming to it in all its holy Commands. Now this his moſt perfect Obedience is made over, reckoned and *imputed* to his Members, *Rom.* 5. 19. as if they themſelves, in their own perſons, had performed it. The Laws Righteouſneſs is not ful-

Rom. 10. 5. filled *in them formally*, ſubjectively, *inherently*, or *perſonally*, but legally, and *imputatively*, they being in Chriſt as their *Head and Surety*, and ſo Chriſts Obedience becomes ours *by imputation*.

Object. 3. But we find divers *Saints in Scripture recorded for perfect men*; *Noah*, *Job*, *Caleb*, &c.

Sol. *But were they perfect with a ſinleſs perfection?* If you prove not that, you do but beat the Air. We eaſily grant a Perfection of *parts*, we utterly deny Perfection of *degrees*, ſuch as admits not the *leaſt taint* of defect or ſin. We ſay, that men may be very *eminent* in Grace, but yet even then not *exactly* conformable to the Law. An *Evangelical* Perfection we admit, 'tis no more than *ſincerity*. A *Legal* Perfection we deny, that in this life is an impoſſibility.

Object. But the Romaniſts flee an *higher* pitch, and not content with *perfect performance* of what is commanded, they tell us, *they can*, *and do do more:* Crying up their *Evangelical Counſels*, as they call them, for *rare things* indeed, and ſuch as far tranſcend Moral, or *Evangelical Precepts*. He that gives ear to theſe Counſels, and follows theſe, is a *Saint indeed*, and doth indeed *do more* than God requires.

Chamier. Tom. 3. l. 10. c. 20. de Conſiliis. *Sol.* But what are theſe *Evangelical Counſels*, that are diſtinct from *Evangelical Precepts? Bellarmine*, *Alphonſus* and *Platus*, concur in their Deſcription of an *Evangelical Counſel*; and they thus decipher it: *It is Chriſt's commending only, but not commanding a good work: which, if not done, doth not at all expoſe to condemnation; but if done, merits a greater degree of Glory; a Coronet at leaſt in Heaven.* A Counſel differs from a Precept in matter, ſubject, form, and end. The *matter* of a Precept is more *facile*, and eaſie: But that of a Counſel more *hard*, and difficult. Obedience to a Precept ſprings from a *Principle of Nature*; but Obedience, or liſtning to a Counſel owes it ſelf to none, but a *ſupernatural Principle*. To obey a Precept is *good*, but to conform to a Counſel *much better*. But then for the *ſubject*. *All* are bound to obey Evangelical Precepts; but *only ſome few* choice ſelect *Privado's* of Hea-

ven

ven are concerned with Evangelical Counsels. The *form* also differs. A Precept obliges by *its own proper* Power and Authority to Obedience; but a Counsel leaves it *in the breast* and *liberty* of the person to whom its given, whether he will follow it, yea or no. *Lastly*, they differ no less in their *end*. The end, or effect of a Precept is a *reward* to him that obeys, *punishment* to him that doth not: But the end of a *Counsel* is a *greater reward* to him that observes it, but *not the least punishment* or frown on him that neglects, and not observes it. *But* are there indeed any such *Evangelical Counsels* contra-distinct from *Evangelical Precepts?* Yes, say the *Papists*, and to that end charge us with these three Texts, which, they say, do all prove that there are some *Evangelical Counsels* which fall not under a Command.

Object. 1. *Mat.* 13. 8. But other fell into *good ground*, and brought forth fruit, *some an hundred fold*, *some sixty fold*, *some thirty fold*. Here, saith *Bellarmine*, the Lord compares the Church to *good ground*, whereof one part brought forth *an hundred*, another *sixty*, another *thirty fold*, and he alleadgeth the Authority of *Hieronymus*, *Cyprian*, and *Austin* for this interpretation of this Parable: *viz.* That Christ doth here distinguish between the different merit of *chaste Marriage*, *Widowhood*, and *Virginity*; and that Virginity is a *greater* good, and more *meritorious* in the sight of God, than either *chaste Widowhood*, or *Conjugal Chastity*. But this, saith *Bellarmine*, is an *Evangelical Counsel* only, not a Command: for what God commands not, and yet commends, and prefers it before other things, he doth, without all doubt, *counsel only*, and advise.

Sol. 1. But what Reasons do those *Fathers* of the Church give for this interpretation? Here *Bellarmine* is silent.

2. Let their own *Maldonate* answer for us, and Truth. *A Christo tantum propositum fuit*, *ut doceret omne semen*, *&c.* Christ's intent here was only this, to teach us, that all seed which fell on good ground did so multiply, that that which brought forth the *least* increase, produced thirty fold, even so much, as none but the best and most cultivated ground was wont to bring forth: that which brought-forth most, an hundred; the middle good-ground, sixty; and if this be the genuine sense of the Text, what doth it make for *Bellarmine* in the least, seeing *fruitfulness* in hearing the Word, and enjoying of *Ordinances*, doth no less belong to *Precepts*, than *Counsels?*

Object. 2. *Mat.* 19. 21. Jesus said unto him, *If thou wilt be perfect*, *go and sell that thou hast*, *and give to the poor*, *and thou shalt have treasure in Heaven*, *and come and follow me*. Here, saith *Bellarmine*, an Evangelical Counsel is plainly distinguisht from a Precept. The *Precept* we have in his answer to the young man's question, Good Master, what good thing shall I do, that *I may* have eternal life? *viz. Keep the Commandments*; There's the Precept, Vers. 16. 17. and to obey, that is sufficient for Salvation. But then he subjoins, *If thou wilt be perfect*,

i. e.

i. e. ſaith *Bellarmine*, if thou art *not contented* with bare Eternal Life, but doſt aſpire unto, and breathe after *a more excellent degree* in that Eternal Life, Then go, ſell all, *&c.* Here's the Counſel.

Sol. 1. In theſe words Chriſt doth not give any *Evangelical Counſel* in the Papiſts ſenſe. For

1. No greater reward than bare *Eternal Life* is propoſed by Chriſt to him. Chriſt only ſaith to him, *Thou ſhalt have treaſure in Heaven*; which phraſe is common to all thoſe, to whom the hope of Eternal Life is propoſed: *Matth. 6.* 20. *Lay up for your ſelves treaſures in Heaven.* Now a *bare Heaven*, according to them, is not a *ſufficient* reward for the Obedience of an *Evangelical Counſel.*

2. We utterly deny *Bellarmine*'s *Gloſs* on theſe words, *If thou wilt be perfect*, i. e. if thou aſpire to an excellent degree in Eternal Life: but rather thus, *If by the Obſervation of the Commandments here thou wouldſt obtain Life Eternal hereafter*, 'tis neceſſary that thou ſhouldſt be *perfect* in thy Obſervation of them. But thou art not *perfect*, and therefore, in that way, thou canſt not hope to obtain Eternal Life. Waſt thou *perfect*, thou wouldſt go and ſell all thou haſt, and give to the poor, but this thou wilt not do. The Perfection then that our Saviour intends, is a Perfection of Grace *in this Life*, not an higher *degree of reward in the next.* And that appears,

1. In our Saviour's anſwer to him, *Mar.* 10. 21. *One thing thou lackeſt:* and *Luke* 18. 22. Here our Saviour gives check to his vain boaſting.

2. When he was gone away ſorrowful, mark what our Saviour adds, *A rich man ſhall hardly enter into the Kingdom of Heaven*, Verſ. 23. He doth not ſay, Shall not obtain a Golden Coronet, or a *greater degree of* Glory; but plainly, He ſhall not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven. Whence it follows, that this young man, becauſe he did not follow our Saviour's counſel, was in danger *of loſing Eternal Life.* Now the Papiſts aſſert, That he that refuſeth to hearken to an *Evangelical Counſel*, ſhall incur *no puniſhment*; and let themſelves be Judges, whether *excluſion* from Heaven be no puniſhment.

Obiect. 3. 1 *Cor.* 7. 25, 26. &c. *Paul* counſels, but doth not command *Virginity* and *Continency* to the *Corinthians.*

Sol. 1. *It doth not follow*, that becauſe *Paul* ſaith, *I give my judgment*, therefore he doth not command. Compare this with 2 *Cor.* 8. 10. *Herein I give my advice*, γνώμην ἐν τούτῳ δίδωμι. This was concerning Almſdeeds; and do any Papiſts number Exhortations to them among Evangelical Counſels? Or will they admit Marriage to be an Evangelical Counſel? and yet *Paul* adviſeth to it, 1 *Cor.* 7. 2. *To avoid Fornication, let every one have his own wife.*

2. *Evangelical Counſels have always a greater reward in Heaven propoſed to the Obſervers of them.* Read the whole Chapter, and ſee, whether *Paul* holds forth a more *Glorious Crown* to Virginity, yea, whether

ther he doth so much as *barely* promise *Eternal Life* to it.

3. *Evangelical Counsels are not backt with the intimations of Temporal Commodities*, as these are here, Vers. 26, 28, 34.

Let this suffice for the *first* Conclusion. I proceed to the *second.*

2. *Were it possible for the best of Saints perfectly to keep the Law of God,* yet *even these supposed perfect ones cannot in the least oblige God, or merit any thing from the hand of his Justice.* When we have done *all* those things which are commanded us, we are *still unprofitable servants* to our Sovereign Lord, we have done *but that which was our duty* to do. As to Merit, *properly* and *strictly* so called, *it is the just desert of a voluntary action, whereunto a proportionable reward is due out of Justice, so that if it be not given, an injury is really committed, and he, to whom retribution properly appertaineth, should be really unjust if he did not exactly compensate.* Some of the *Papists* soar very high in this point, and tell us *roundly*, that good Works do not only merit in respect of God's *Gracious Covenant*, but in regard of the *worthiness of the Works* themselves: And that God, for the greater honour of his Children, would have them to get Heaven *by their Merit*, which is more *honourable* to them than to receive it *by God's free gift.* 'Tis not for such *high-born* Souls as theirs humbly to expect and obtain Everlasting Happiness, *as a Beggar doth his Alms*; but to *attaque* Heaven by storm, to enter upon, and possess it, as the *just reward* of their Works, and to ride *triumphantly* through it as Conquerors. *Others* of the Papists seem more *modest*, and they tell us, that the Saints do merit indeed, but then *their merits are subordinate to Christ's merits*; nay, say they, they are *derived* from them, for Christ hath *merited for us the power and grace of meriting:* And therefore this Doctrine of Merit is *far* enough from *obscuring* the Glory of Christ's Merits: It rather argues the wonderful *efficacy* of them. 'Tis no *blemish* to the Sun, that the Moon and Stars shine with a *borrowed* Light from it. *Fruitfulness* of the Branches is no *disparagement* to the Vine. The *dependent* and *subordinate* efficacy of second Causes, is no *detraction* from the *All-sufficiency* and *Omnipotency* of the first. But for all these *sugred* words and fair pretences, we shall endeavour to make it evident, that such a fansied merit of pardon of sin, and eternal life, even by our best works, is an *ungrounded*, novel, *unnecessary*, impossible fiction. 2 *Conclusion.* Tapperus in Explic. Artic. Lovan. Tom. 2. art. 9. Bell. de just. l. 5. c. 16, 17.

1. *Wholly ungrounded on the Scriptures.* That Christ's Merit hath purchased for us *Grace* for the performance of good Works, we readily *grant:* but that he hath merited that we might merit, we utterly deny, as being a thing unheard of in the Writings of the Prophets and Apostles.

2. *Novel*; 'tis *a new upstart* Opinion, so says that *Malleus Jesuitarum*, the incomparable *Usher.* In former times of Popery, the ordinary Instruction appointed to be given to men on their Death-beds, was, *That they should look to come to glory, not by their own Merits*, but by the *Virtue* and *Merits* of Christ's Passion; and place *their whole con-*

fidence in his *Death only*, and in *no other thing*, and interpose his Death between God and their sins. This made *William of Wickham*, Founder of New Colledge, profess, he trusted in Christ alone for Salvation; and *Charles the Eighth* did the like when he came to die; and *Bellarmine himself*, when he was at the brink of Eternity, to profess, *Tutissimum est, &c.* give me a Christ, rather than all other pretended Merits whatever.

3. *An unnecessary fiction.* Hath Christ a *fulness* of Merit, and that of infinite value, to purchase *Reconciliation* and *Acceptation* both of our *Persons* and *Services*, together with an Everlasting *Inheritance* in the Kingdom of Heaven? Yea or no? If it be denied, 'tis easily proved out of *Dan.* 9. 24, 26. *Col.* 10. 19, 20. *Joh.* 17. 2. *Heb.* 9. 12, 15. If it be *granted*, that the Merit of Christ is of *infinite* value, and that by it he hath purchased in the behalf of his Members a *full right* unto Eternal Life and Happiness; if Christ hath merited for us *perfection*, and fulness of Grace and Glory, what *necessity* is there that we our selves should do this again?

Entia non sunt multiplicanda sine necessitate.

4. *'Tis impossible.* We cannot possibly by our *best Works* merit Eternal Life. We are saved by *Mercy*, not *Merit*, *Rom.* 3. 20. and *Rom.* 4. 2, 4, 6. by *Grace*, not of *Works*, Ephes. 2. 8, 9. *Tit.* 3. 5, 6, 7. and if by Grace, by Grace *alone*, not by Works, no *blending* of Grace and Works together, *Rom.* 11. 6. To evidence this, let us but duly consider the necessary *Ingredients* of Merit, and apply them to the *best Works* of the *best of Saints*. To render a Work *properly* and *strictly meritorious* of a reward, 'tis *necessary* that

1. *There should be some equality, proportion, and suitableness between the Work and the Reward.* But is there any *equality* betwixt the *enjoyment* of God in Heaven, and *our imperfect* Works on Earth? If I present my *Prince* with an *Horse* or *Dog*, and he requites me with a *Lordship*, will any man say I have merited that *Lordship?* Of all Works none comparable to *Martyrdom:* but yet what compare between a Crown of *Thorns* here, and a Crown of *Glory* hereafter? 2 *Cor.* 4. 17. not worthy to be named the same day, *Rom.* 8. 18.

2. *That the Work done be profitable and advantageous to him of whom any thing is merited.* But can a sinful man *be profitable unto God?* Job 22. 2, 3. and 35. 7, 8. Can a man, he doth not mean an *ordinary*, sickly, *weak*, frail man, but *a man at his best*, a man in the *flower* and *perfection*, not only of his natural abilities, but in the *richest Furniture* and *Array* of his *acquired* and inspired *Perfections*. Take this man, a man of these *Attainments* and Accomplishments, and can *he be profitable* to God? can he bring any *advantage*, gain or profit unto God? Be he never so *holy*, never so *righteous*, doth the Lord receive any *advantage* by him, so as thereby God is his *Debtor*, and become *beholden* to him? No, no. The best of men cannot *oblige* God. The great *JEHOVAH* is *perfect* in himself, and therefore cannot receive any *addition:* he is

self-

self-sufficient, and therefore needs no addition. Holy *David* humbly acknowledges this, *Psal.* 16. 2. *My goodness extendeth not to thee: i.e.* I am not able to do any good which reacheth to thy benefit, or increaseth thy happiness. Exod. 19. 5. Deut. 32. 9.

Object. But is not the Church of the Jews called *God's peculiar treasure?* and is there *no profit* in a treasure?

Sol. Yes. They are called his treasure, *not* because they *profit him*, *but* because he *protects* them, as a man would his *treasure* that is most *dear* to him.

Object. But is not *the glorifying of God* an advantage to him?

Sol. Our glorifying of God adds no more to him, than the *reflecting* Glass doth to the most beautiful Face. It only *shews* what God *is*, it doth not *add* to what God *hath:* Nay, at best 'tis but a *dusty cracked Glass*, *Mat.* 5. 16. A little *Taper* adds more Light to the *Sun*, than *all* men do or can to God.

3. *That it be a Work that is not already due.* Doth any man deserve an Estate for that *Money* whereby he *discharges* an old Debt. That which is *our duty* to do, cannot possibly *merit* when 'tis *done.* We cannot oblige either God or man by *performing* our *Obligation.* All the Works we can do for God, are *deserved* by him. Hath not he *created* us? Doth he not every moment *uphold* our Souls in life? Hath he not *redeem'd* us, and so is infinitely before-hand with us every way? Dare any say, that God doth not deserve that they should do *the utmost they can* for his Service and Glory? If he doth, is it not *Pride* and *Impudence* to pretend merit from God? Thus our Saviour argues in *the Text*, where he proves, that, because the servant had done no more *than was his duty to do*, therefore he did not *merit* in doing it: *When ye have done all, say, We are unprofitable servants, we have done that which was our duty to do.* He that hath done all those things that are commanded him, is a man indeed, *a man of worth*, a man of men: but where to be found on Earth? But let it be granted, that he hath reacht to the utmost line of the Command, he is yet *an unprofitable servant*, he hath done *but his duty.* A man of *worth* he may be, a man of *merit* he is not, he cannot be. There neither is, nor can be any good Work acceptable to God, which God hath not commanded. Of all other Works whatever his Query is, *Who hath required them at your hands?* Isai. 1. 12. and if it be commanded, then it is due to God; and if so, then by giving that to God which is his *due*, we do not merit, no not so much *as thanks*, *Luke* 17. 9, 10. We are not our own, we are the Lord's. We are bought with a price, we owe our whole selves for our *Creation* and *Redemption*, 1 *Cor.* 6, 20. and therefore we ought to glorifie God in our *Bodies* and *Souls*, which are the *Lord's.* If we our *Selves*, our *Bodies* and *Spirits* are the Lord's, much more are all our *Services* his. If the Person be anothers, all the work that is or can be done by him are his too.

4. *That, what good Works we do, be our own.* A man cannot merit

by giving that *to* another, which he had *from* him to whom he gave it. A King's *Almoner* merits not by distributing his *Sovereigns* Alms. Now every good gift, and every perfect gift, is *from above*, *Jam.* 1.17. What hath, or doth the best of Saints, *that he hath not received?* 1 *Cor.* 4.7. Is it not the *Lord that worketh in them*, both to will and do? *Phil.* 2. 12, 13. Do not all Works that are good, as they are good, proceed from his *Spirit?* Are they not the *Fruits* that spring from that Divine Root? *Gal.* 5.20. Is not Repentance *his gift? Act.* 11.18. and 5.31. Is it not given to us *both to believe and to suffer? Phil.* 1.29. *Without him*, *can we*, of our selves, *do any thing?* Joh. 15.5. Nay, can we so much as *think a good thought* of our selves? 2 *Cor.* 3.5. Is it not he that works *all our works for us*, *and in us?* Isai. 26.12. And therefore certainly by them God cannot be bound to bestow more upon us. Hence *Durandus*, to the great regret of *Merit-mongers*, with much zeal and strength, impugns and contends against the merit of Condignity.

Durand. in l. 2. Sen. dist. 27. q. 2.

5. *That it be not mixt and tainted with sin.* That Action which needs a *Pardon*, cannot deserve a *Reward.* Can that, for which we deserve *Hell*, and Eternal *Death*, merit *Heaven*, and Eternal *Life?* Now as good Works are wrought by us, they are *defiled* and mixed with so much *weakness* and imperfection, that they cannot endure the severity of God's Judgment, *Isai.* 64.6. *Gal.* 5.17. *Rom.* 5.17, 18. *Psal.* 143.2. and 130.3. All our Graces are *imperfect*, all our Duties are *polluted*; and therefore stand in need of *Favour*, Grace and Acceptation: and where then is their merit?

Object. 1. *But is not Eternal Life called a Reward? and doth not that strongly prove merit? Mat.* 5.12. Great is your *Reward.*

Sol. 1. *Compare* Scripture with Scripture, and then judge. Is not Eternal Life said to be the *Gift of God? Rom.* 6.23. Can a free Gift be *deserved* or merited? Again, is not Eternal Life called *an Inheritance?* Rom. 8.17. Gal. 4.7. Ephes. 1.14, 18. Col. 1.12. Can the same Estate be mine by *Inheritance*, and by *Purchase?*

Yes, say the Papists. The *Glory* which Christ had, was his by *Inheritance*, for he was Heir of all things, *Heb.* 1.2. and yet 'twas his by *Purchase* too: He dearly paid for it, *Phil.* 2.7, 8, 9, 10.

True, but this was *in divers respects*, because he had two Natures: As he was the *Eternal Son* of God, it was his *Inheritance*, and belonged to the Manhood only as united to the Godhead. As he was *Man*, he might, and did *Purchase* it by what he did, and suffered in the flesh. But in Saints there are not two Natures, nor any ground of pretence for Purchase.

2. Doth not the Scripture clearly speak *of two kinds of Rewards*, *of Grace and of Debt?* and withal affirms, that the Reward that God gives to good men, is meerly *of Grace*, not of *Debt*, *Rom.* 4.4.

Bellarmine tells us it may be of both.

No.

No; The Apostle utterly forbids that: If it be of Grace, *then is it no more of works*, Rom. 11. 6.---4. 4, 5.

Object. 2. But God gives this *reward* to men, *for working in his Vineyard*, Mat. 20. 8.

Sol. True, but still the reward appears *to be of grace*, else why should he that came in *at the last hour*, receive *as much* as they that had born the heat and burthen of the day? ver. 12.

Object. 3. But God is said to reward men *according to their works*; according to, *i. e.* according to the *proportion* of them, and that implies merit, *Rev.* 20. 13. 2 *Cor.* 11. 15.

Sol. I must demur to this gloss on these Texts, and that,

1. Because, since God is pleas'd to reward in us his own gifts and graces, not our Merits, as *Bernard* speaks, *He may still keep a proportion, and to them to whom he gave more grace here, he may give more glory hereafter*, and yet there is no more *merit* in this *additional* reward, than in the rest.

2. I may as well conclude, *the blind men merited their sight*, because Christ saith, Be it unto you *according to your Faith*, Mat. 9. 29. as we may gather Merit from this phrase, *according to your works.*

Object. 4. *Good works mentioned, as the Causes, for which God gives eternal Life*, Mat. 25. 35. Come ye blessed, &c. *for I was hungry*, and ye gave me meat, &c.

Sol. Paul did not think this a good Argument; for though he knew that it was said of *Abraham, Because thou hast done this thing*, I will bless thee: yet he flatly denies the *merit* of *Abrahams works*, Rom. 4. 2, 6. *Gal.* 3. 5. And, when he says of himself, I obtained mercy, *because I did it ignorantly*, 1 Tim. 1. 13. who can imagine that he means *that his ignorance merited mercy.* The King said, I forgive thee all thy debt, *because thou desiredst me*, Mat. 18. 32. Did his *meer asking* deserve it? Gen. 22. 16, 17.

Object. 5. *Good men own'd by God, as worthy of the Kingdom of God*, 2 Thess. 1: 5. Rev. 3. 4.

Sol. These are said to be *worthy*, not as the *Labourer is worthy of his hire*, Mat. 10. 10. Luke 10. 7. 1 Tim. 5. 17, 18.

1. But *Comparatively*, in respect of *other men*, that are most *unworthy.*

2. *By Gods gracious acceptation of them, in, and through Christ*, Acts 5. 41. Mat. 22. 8. But otherwise the *holiest* of Saints have ever judged themselves most *unworthy* of the least of God's mercies. So far have they been from *proudly* thinking themselves worthy of eternal life. A worthiness *of fitness and meetness* for Heaven in Saints we acknowledge, as the word ἄξιος is rightly rendred, *Matt.* 3. 8. and yet it is God's grace alone that gives the Saints this fitness; *Col.* 1. 12. 'Tis God alone that makes us thus *meet to be partakers* of the inheritance of the Saints in light. 'Tis therefore no less than *impudence* to pretend to *merit* from God by it: and if yet any will be so *audacious* as to boast Gen. 32. 10. Mat. 8. 8. Luke 7. 6, 7. 2 Thes. 1. 3. Phil. 1. 27. Luke 21. 35. 2 Thes. 1. 5. Col. 1. 12.

of

of their own worth and merit, let them be pleased to answer the Apostle's close, and cutting questions; 1 *Cor.* 4, 7. Who *maketh thee to differ?* and what *hast thou*, that thou didst not *receive?* now if thou didst receive it, why dost thou *glory* as if thou didst not receive it?

Use 1. *Infer.* 1. If then legal, *sinless* Perfection, and merit *for our selves* by our best works, notwithstanding all its *plausible pretexts*, stands convicted, and cast, *what shall we think of works of Supererogation?* what intollerable *arrogance*, boldly, and without a *blush* to affirm, that *divers of the Saints have not only merit enough to purchase eternal life for themselves, but a great deal to spare for the relief of others.* This self-advancing, and *heaven-daring* Doctrine of works of *Supererogation*, what self-searching soul is there that looks not on it as the highest *strain*, two or three notes at least above *Ela*, indeed such a note, as not the holiest *Teraphim*, *Seraphim*, *Arch-Angel*, durst ever yet pretend to reach to, no not in their highest *Halelujahs*. *Supererogation*! both the word and thing point out to us the *Top Round* of the Popish Arrogancy. Or if you please, you may look upon it as the grand *Bellows of the Popes Kitchin* here, and of his *comfortable importance*, his most beneficial *Laboratory*, viz. *Purgatory*, hereafter.

The *Papists* jumble in this Doctrine among the croud of several other ungrounded, *unscriptural*, novel, and *absurd* opinions. And, that you may see that it is much *beneath* these grand *Sophy's*, *vel delirare*, *vel insanire*, *nisi cum ratione*, thus they erect their *Babel.* A *Lanscape* whereof is exactly drawn by the skilful *pencil* of the *truly Reverend and Learned Davenant.*

Dav. in Colos. 1. 24.

1. First then they readily acknowledg and declare, *that God-man Christ Jesus did fully satisfie the Justice of God by his offering up of himself a sacrifice for sin, and that by that Sacrifice did fully expiate the sins of Believers.* A truth this written with a *Sun-beam.* But then with the *Text*, you must take the *Popish Comment* too. This satisfaction and expiation, say they, is to be understood only in respect of their guilt of *mortal sins*, and of their *eternal* punishment due thereupon, but not at all in respect of their *temporal* punishment. As for *this*, they are wholly left to themselves, either to *sink* or *swim*; and notwithstanding all that Christ hath done, *suffered*, purchased, *promised*, Believers are still *liable* to it, and that not only in the *present* World, but for some time, at least in the *next*, *i. e.* in *Purgatory.*

To follow them καθ' ὑπόδας step by step.

Culpam remitti, nihil aliud est, quam non imputari ad pœnam Durand. l. 4.

1. As to that pretty *new-coin'd* distinction between the *full remission* of the *guilt* of sin, and yet *inflicting* of the *punishment* after the pardon of the *guilt.* Tell me, what is *guilt?* is it not *a liableness and being bound over to punishment?* Is it any thing more or less: therefore if the *guilt* be taken away, of necessity the *punishment* must be taken away also. All punishment results from *guilt*, and from guilt alone, and there-

therefore if there be a full *expiation of that*, the punishment must needs cease, let the *kind* of it be what it will. If a sin be *remitted*, pardoned, *forgiven*, it cannot in equity be *punished*. All punishment in order to satisfaction of justice is utterly *inconsistent* with the nature and tenor of *remission* of sin. 'Tis a great and known *maxim*, *In sublata culpa, tollitur & pœna*; and backt by the concurrent testimony of the Ancient. The truth is, to affirm the contrary, is to make remission of sin a meer *Bauble*, or rather a *Taunting* jeer, or stinging *Sarcasm*. As if a *Creditor* should say to his *Debtor*, poor soul, I freely *forgive* thee all thou owest me, only I must throw thee into a *Dungeon* full of Scorpions and Serpents, and these must sting and torment thee *years without number*; but for thy comfort, know, that 'tis not for the *millions* but *mites* thou owest me. *Purgatory*-fire is not for *mortal* but *venial* sins, little peccadillo's. Or as if a *Judge* or *King* should cause an *O yes* to be made, and then proclaim a free and gracious *pardon* to a desperate *malefactor*, or rather to his own prodigal, *rebellious Son*; thus, Son, I do, before Men and *Angels*, and in the face of the whole World, *freely forgive* you all your debaucheries, *rebellions*, treasons, I frankly quit you from the *guilt* of all your bloody crimes, only I remember *some little incogitancies*, some slight slips of your youth; and these I must not, cannot pardon. For *these* therefore, such is my tender compassion, you shall only be stretch'd, and held on a *Rack*, thrown on a burning *Gridiron*, feed on *flames* of Sulphur, and have plentiful *draughts* of scalding-*lead*.--- O brethren, what humane ear could bear such *stabbing* language? *Mutato nomine de Papicolis narratur fabula.*

Exempto reatu eximitur & pœna, Terr. de Bapt. c 5. ὅπου συγχώρησις, ἀδεμία κόλασις, Chrys. hom. 8. ad Rom.

2. *Hath not Christ by his perfect Obedience and Sacrifice of himself fully satisfied the justice of his Father, and purchased perfect reconciliation?* By the *obedience* of that one man, the second *Adam*, *are not many*, even all elected, converted, believing, penitent sinners *made righteous before God*? *Rom.* 5. 19. Hath not Christ by one offering *perfected for ever* them that are sanctified? *Hebr.* 10.14. Doth not the Blood of Christ *throughly purge our Conscience* from the *guilt* of dead works as well as *filth*? *Heb.* 9. 14. Hath not Christ loved us, *and given himself for us an offering, and a Sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savour to all* gracious intents and purposes? *Eph.* 5. 2. Did not Christ by his death *finish the transgression*, and make an end of sins? Hath he not made *perfect reconciliation* for iniquity, and brought in *everlasting Righteousness*? *Dan.* 9. 24, 26. *Col.* 1. 19, 20. *Rom.* 3. 24, 25, 26.

Vere Christus communicando nobiscum sine culpa pœnam, & culpam solvit, & pœnam, August.

3. *Where do we find in the whole Scripture, any the least hint of such a restriction or limitation*, that Christ hath satisfied for *eternal* and not for *temporal* punishment? Did he not bear the one as well as the other? *Isa.* 53. 4, 5. Surely he hath born *all* our griefs, carried *all* our sorrows, is wounded for *all* our transgressions, bruised for *all* our iniquities, the chastisement of our *whole* peace was upon him, and by his *stripes only* we are *fully* healed. The *indefinites* in the Text clearly include

clude an universal. *Christ his own self bare all our sins*, that is, the guilt and punishment of them *in his body on the Tree, and therefore* doubtless takes off from the sinner what he bare in his own person, 1 *Pet.* 2.24.

4. But tell me, *Papists*, suppose you laid your ear close to that *fiery dungeon* of Purgatory, and should there hear *elected Believers*, such for whom Christ hath eternal *love*, and particularly *died*, and such as are truly *regenerated* and adopted; (for none but such are there, according to your selves): Suppose, I say, you heard an *Asa*, an *Hezekiah*, a *Jehoshaphat*, a *Mary Magdalen*, nay one of your own most holy *Popes*, (who all have had their little slips, *venial* sins at least) yelling, *howling*, crying out with *Dives, wo is us, wo is us*, for we are *tormented* in this flame. And, though they cannot, *dare* not in the least *murmur* against, or impatiently complain of God, (that were a *mortal* sin, not committable in *Purgatory*) yet might they not without offence complain to God in such language as this: *Ah dear Father*, the Father of thy *dearest* Son our only *Surety and Saviour*, who now sits at thy right-hand, and where one day *we shall* sit near him; wert not thou *he* that didst most *freely* and faithfully promise us, when we were on earth, to *blot out* all our sins as a cloud, and our transgressions as a mist? *Isa.* 43.25. To *cover* them with the robes of thy Son's Righteousness? *Psal.* 32. 1, 2. To cast all our sins into the *depth of the Sea*? *Mic.*7. 18,19. *Not to impute* our trespasses? *Rom.* 4. 8. Yea, though they were sought for, *that they should not be found*? *Isa.* 26. *Never to mention them more*? *Ezek.* 18. 22. Nay, never to *remember* them more? *Jer.* 31.34. Ah dear Father, were these indeed thy *promises*, and didst thou in our life-time, *by thy Spirit, seal* to our Consciences the faithful performance of them? and is this thy performance of them? Is this thy kindness to thy friend? as once *Rebeccah*, if it be so, *why are we thus*? *Gen.* 25. 22. Is all thy promised *mercy* come to this? O consider and see *whether there be any sorrow greater than our sorrow*, which is done unto us, wherewith the Lord himself, our Father, and not the Divel, hath afflicted us, *in the day of his fierce anger.* True indeed, our *mountains* are buried in the depth of the Sea, but our *molehills* sink us; all our *talent-debts* are paid, but we lie, and rot, and burn, and die, for some *little fees.* Tell me, *Papists*, if you heard such a complaint as this, would it not make your *bowels* to wamble? would you not be apt to bid 'em *hush*, and be still, for fear, lest it should be nois'd in *Gath*, and blab'd abroad in the streets of *Askelon*; lest that on the other side of the wall, in *Hell*, (which, you say, stands but the next wall to *Purgatory*), a damned *Caitiff* should hear it, and say, *Aha, aha*, thus would we have it; thus, oh thus let all those be served, and saved, that, while they lived on earth, *believed on*, and were *obedient to a crucified Jesus.* In one word, for God to elect, *redeem*, regenerate, *justify*, *adopt*, *sanctify*, accept, *promise*, swear, and to do yet much more for pardoned sinners on earth, and yet in a *vindictive*

Vindictive way, in order to the *satisfaction* of Justice, thus to punish, what is it less than the highest *contradiction?*

Object. 1. But we must not think the learned *Bellarmine* will be so easily *muzzled: bark* he will and must, though *bite* he cannot. If Christ, saith he, satisfied for all the fault and punishment, *why then do we suffer so many evils after the remission of guilt?* Doth not God lay many evils on pardoned persons? Was not *Moses* pardoned as to his rash anger, but yet *must die* in *Mount Nebo* for his trespass? *Deut.* 32. 48. *&c.* The *Israelites* pardoned, but yet *punished*, *Numb.* 14. 20, 21, 22, 23. *David* pardoned, but yet the *Child* must die, and the Father stabb'd through the Child's loins, 2 *King.* 12. 14. Bellarm. de Purg. l. 1. c. 10.

Sol. 1. These are not *properly* and *strictly punishments.* True, *materially* they look like such, and may be owned as such, but not *formally.* Fatherly *Chastisements* they are, Legal *Punishments* they are not: *Medicinal*, but not *Penal: Rhubarb*, not *Poison: Lancets* only, not *Stiletto*'s: Ligaments, not Halters. They do not come from God's *Vindictive* Wrath, nor doth he in the least design them for the *satisfaction* of his Justice; but they proceed from other *causes*, and are designed for other *ends.* They are the Issues of his Paternal *love* and tenderness, *Heb.* 12. 5, 6. *Rev.* 3. 19. To make them more *sensible* of the evil of sin, *Jer.* 4. 18. To *prove* their Graces, *Deut.* 8. 16. To *purge* their Consciences, *Isai.* 27. 9. *Refine* their Spirits, *Zech.* 13. 9. 1 *Pet.* 1. 6. and to *save* their Souls, 1 *Cor.* 11. 32. 2 *Cor.* 4. 17. For God *thus* to afflict and punish, may very well stand with pardoning Grace; but to punish under any notion of *satisfaction*, save only that of Christ, cannot.

Object. 2. *Death is the wages of sin*, Rom. 6. 23. *and yet the righteous*, though all their sins are forgiven in Christ, *are not delivered from death.*

Sol. 1. At the last day they *shall be delivered* from death it self, 1 *Cor.* 15. 26, 55.

2. In death, are delivered from *the sting and curse* of death, 1 *Cor.* 15. 56. *Heb.* 2. 75.

3. In that they die, *this is out of God's love*, Isai. 57. 1, 2. 2 *King.* 22. 20. And that because,

1. It frees them *perfectly* from sin and misery, *Ephes.* 5. 26, 27. *Rev.* 14. 13.

2. It makes them *capable* of further *Communion* with God in Glory, which they then enter upon, *Luke* 23. 43. *Phil.* 1. 23.

Thus much as to their first Assertion, we proceed to the *second.*

II. They tell us, That *for the preventing or removing of these temporal punishments both here and in Purgatory*, (notwithstanding the fulness of Christ's satisfaction and merit) there must be *humane satisfactions made to God by Believers themselves, and that for themselves or others.* At this hole creep in a world of *Popish* Vanities: Hence severe *Penances*, frequent *Fastings*, late *Vigils*, tedious *Pilgrimages*, bloody corporal *Lashings*,

ings, voluntary *Poverty*. All these are *Humane satisfactions before* death. *After* death, *Masses*, *Prayers*, *Dirges*, *Indulgences*, *Pardons*, these for them that at their death are *pinion'd up*, and carried bound to *Purgatory*, and this only for *venial* sins, such as break no *square* at all betwixt God and Souls, such as do *not deserve the loss* of God's favour, nor *exclusion* from Heaven to *Purgatory*, I say, whose flames, and *exquisite* torments differ nothing from those of *Hell* but only in *duration*, the *one* being but for a time, the *other* everlasting.

As to this fine device of *Humane satisfaction* by Believers for themselves or others, we demand,

1. In Christ's Humiliation, *Was there a fulness*, *an all-fulness of satisfaction*, to make an ample *amends* to God's enraged Justice, yea, or no? If it be denied, doubted, or disputed, by the Socinian, or Papist, we thus prove it. The fulness of Christ's satisfaction is,

1. *Most clearly typified in the Old Testament*, in those three famous instances, the *burning* of the Sacrifices by fire from Heaven, *Lev.* 1. 9. *Judg.* 6. 17, 21. 2 *Chron.* 7. 1, 3. and made them ascend towards the place of God's glorious possession. The *compleatness* of the daily bloody Sacrifice, *Exod.* 29. 40. The *sweetness* of the things required in the Meat and Drink-Offering, *Exod.* 29. 40. *Lev.* 2. 2, 15. All these Types of the fulness of Christ's satisfaction.

2. *Plainly asserted in the New Testament*, Ephes. 5. 2. Christ hath given himself for us, *an Offering and a Sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savour*. Wherein observe these two things:

1. *The Sufficiency:* An *Offering* and a *Sacrifice* to God.

2. *The fragrancy and acceptableness unto God of the Offering and Sacrifice of Christ*. Christ's Offering and Sacrifice of himself was as acceptable unto God, as the *sweetest Odours* are unto mens sense of smelling.

3. *Really evidenced by Christ's Exaltation*, *as an evident sign or token thereof*. Christ was thrown into the *Prison* of the Grave, as our *Surety*, for our sins, and no possibility of *delivery* of him thence, but by paying the *utmost* farthing we *owed* unto God's Justice. But now, as the Prophet saith, *He was taken from Prison and Judgment*, Isai. 53. 8. raised from the dead, *taken up into Heaven*, placed at God's right hand, 1 *Cor.* 15. 4. *Mark* 16. 19. there admitted into the glorious exercise of an Authoritative Intercession, *Heb.* 7. 25. A most *convincing* Argument that he hath paid off all our debt, given *full recompence* to God's displeased Holiness, sufficient *satisfaction* to his Justice provoked by our sins. Hereupon that of our Saviour, *John* 16. 8, 10. The Comforter will *convince the World of Righteousness*, *because I go to my Father: i. e.* The Spirit shall *convince* the World, not only that Christ was righteous, or innocent in his own person, and therefore unjustly numbred among transgressors; *but that there was Righteousness enough in him for the justification of the whole World of his Elect:* and the Argument whereby he proves it,

it, is, *Because I go to my Father.* Our sins and God's Justice would have kept Christ still in his Grave, and never admitted him into Heaven, till he had fulfilled all Righteousness: *i. e.* till he had performed all the Duties, and suffered the whole curse of the Law as touching the substance thereof, for those for whom he lived and died a Surety. On this it is that *Paul* firmly grounds his *triumphing* confidence, and *bids defiance* to Sin, Law, Death and Devils, *Rom.* 8. 33, 34. with *Rom.* 4. 25.

4. Plain, *From the infinite Worthiness of his Person*; and that whether you consider Christ's *Humiliation* under the notion of a *Price*, or *Sacrifice.*

1. *As a Price which he paid for us*, of great and inestimable value, by reason of the Worthiness of his Person. The precious Blood of Christ, 1 *Pet.* 1. 18, 19. the Blood of God, *Act.* 20. 28. A full, and sufficient *Price of ransom*, Psal. 130. 7, 8. From the *guilt* and *dominion* of sin, from the *curse* and *rigor* of the Law, all steps and *degrees* of Salvation, from *all* sins, all evil that is in sin, all the sad and miserable *consequents* and effects of sin. And a sufficient *Price of Purchase* to obtain love, kindness, life, righteousness, favour and acceptance, together with all the gracious and glorious *fruits* thereof.

2. *As a Sacrifice, which he offered for us*, an all-pleasing Sacrifice, by reason of the Infiniteness of his Person. *By one Offering for ever perfected those that are sanctified*, Heb. 10. 14. The great *acceptableness* of this Sacrifice unto God, proceeds from the Dignity of the *Priest* offering, the Eternal *Son of God*, in whom God was infinitely well-pleased, *Mat.* 3. 17. From the *Sacrifice* offered, the Blood shed was the *Blood of God*, Act. 20. 28. From the *Altar* on which 'twas offered, the *Divine Nature*, *Heb.* 9. 14. Tell me then, is there in Christ's Humiliation an *all-fulness* of satisfaction to Divine Justice, yea, or no? If so, *What need then in the least of this fig-leaf of Humane satisfaction?* To what purpose do we light up a *dim Taper*, and a *smoaky* Candle, when we have before us the *clear* and full *light* of a mid-day *Sun?* If Christ's *satisfaction* be of infinite price, why may it not serve for the *expiation* of the guilt of *Temporal*, as well as *Eternal* punishment? If there be an *all-sufficiency* in Christ's satisfaction, what need the *supplement* of ours?

Object. 1. Did not *Paul rejoice in his sufferings for the Church, and fill up that which was behind of the afflictions of Christ in his flesh, for his Bodies sake which is the Church?* Col. 1. 24.

Sol. A great difference betwixt *suffering* for the *good* of others, and *satisfying* for the *fault* and *guilt* of others. A *Paul* may do the *former*, a Christ only can do the *latter.* And this was the *sole* cause of *Paul*'s rejoycing, the great *benefit* that accrued to the *Church* by his *suffering.* True indeed, *Paul* is said to *fill up*, *&c.* not as if there were any thing *lacking* or *defective* in the sufferings of Christ, *Heb.* 10. 14.

and 7. 25. but by the sufferings of Christ our Spiritual means, *not Christ personal*, but *Christ mystical*, that is, the *Body Christ*, or true Believers, *i. e.* Christ in his Members, who are usually called Christ, *Act. 9. 4. 2 Cor. 1. 5. Heb. 11. 25.* When Christ had done suffering in his Person, he left it as a *Legacy* to his *Members*, that they should *suffer with him*, and for him, *Act. 9. 16.* and 14. 22. *2 Tim. 3. 12.* Well then, *Paul* suffers for the Church: but how? so as to satisfie God's Justice for them? *Oh no. Paul* rejects this sense with indignation, *Was Paul crucified for you?* 1 Cor. 1. 13. But as he is said sometimes to suffer for Christ, *2 Cor. 12. 10.* not surely to *satisfie* for him, but to *glorifie* him; so he suffers for the *Churches edification*, and *establishment*, and so he elsewhere explains himself, *Phil. 1. 12. 2 Tim. 2. 10.* Hence it is, that *2 Tim. 2. 9.* he is said to labour in the Word even unto bonds. Nor doth *Paul* think by his *sufferings* to *redeem* others from their suffering, but by his *example* to excite them to the same *constancy*: wherefore he saith, he suffered all things for the Elect, not that they should expect *satisfaction* for their sins in the *merit* of his sufferings, but that they might *obtain* the *Salvation* that is in Christ.

Object. Here the *Papists* gravely reply upon us, *Not to supply the wants or defects of Christ's satisfaction, but to apply it unto us.* 'Tis one of the *Instruments* ordained by God, for the *application* of Christ's satisfaction to us in the taking away of *Temporal* punishment.

Sol. Quid verba audiam, shew us the *least tittle* of ground for this *Harangue* in the Book of God.

1. *A new satisfaction no more required* to apply the satisfaction of Christ, *than a new Death*, Redemption, Resurrection is, to apply the Death, Redemption, and Resurrection of Christ.

2. By their own *limitation* and *restriction* of the use of Christ's satisfaction. *They limit the use of Christ's satisfaction*, to the taking away the *fault* only, and that of *mortal* sins alone, and *eternal* punishment due for them; and how then can *Humane* satisfaction apply the satisfaction of Christ for the taking away of *Temporal* punishment?

3. These pretended Humane satisfactions are *no Instruments* of *application* of Christ's satisfaction: for such Instruments are all *Ordinances* of God, branches of his *Worship*, so are not the pains of *Purgatory*. Besides, all means of applying the satisfaction of Christ, proceed from the *Grace*, mercy and favour of God; pains of *Purgatory* from God's *Justice*, and are of a destructive nature.

3. These pretended Humane satisfactions are very *injurious* unto, and *derogatory* from Christ's *satisfaction*, in that

1. *They make Christ's satisfaction to be imperfect*, in that it adds thereunto a supply of Humane satisfaction.

Object. So far from *derogating* from the *Dignity* of Christ's satisfaction, as they *rather* make to the greater *Honour* thereof, because it deriveth all our power of *satisfying* from Christ's *satisfaction*. 'Tis no *derogation* from

from God's Omnipotency, that he works by ſecond Cauſes; that in working the greateſt Miracles, he makes uſe of the *meaneſt* Servants. No *impeachment*, but rather an honour to Chriſt's *ſatisfaction*, to have it advanced ſo far, as that by *virtue* thereof the Members of Chriſt are made *in part* Satisfiers of Divine Juſtice.

Sol. One tittle of Scripture-proof for this, or elſe the *Proteſtant's Negation* is as *authentick* as the *Papiſt's Aſſertion.*

2. *It communicates to man power of ſatisfying, which is the peculiar and incommunicative Prerogative of Chriſt alone.* This appears from *two* grand fruits of Chriſt's ſatisfaction, proper and peculiar thereunto, *viz. Redemption*, and *Reconciliation.*

1. *Redemption.* Chriſt alone hath redeemed us, *Gal.* 3. 13. Now if *Redemption* be not communicated, *ergo* not *ſatisfaction*; for Redemption is founded on ſatisfaction. Now *Papiſts* themſelves acknowledge no Mediator of Redemption beſides him, *Heb.* 1. 3.

2. *Full and perfect Reconciliation with God*, Rom. 5. 10. Col. 1. 21, 22. Theſe and like places to be underſtood excluſive. *Reconciled to God, i. e.* only by Chriſt's Blood and Death, *Iſai.* 53. 5. No *Chaſtiſement* whatever, beſide that of his, can pacifie God's wrath againſt us, or can procure our peace with him. *Papiſts* acknowledge, that nothing which ſinful man can do or ſuffer, is able to purchaſe the return of God's favour and friendſhip: ſo then if mens beſt works and greateſt ſufferings cannot reconcile us unto God, neither can they ſatisfie the Juſtice of God, becauſe Reconciliation of God to man follows ſatisfaction to his Juſtice; and if God be once fully and perfectly reconciled, no place for any other puniſhment, *though but temporal*, becauſe the Friends of God, and Members of Chriſt cannot be *condemned.*

2 Cor. 5. 19: Pſal. 51. 9. and 103. 12. Iſai. 38. 17. and 1. 8.

Object. But Humane ſatisfactions are to us very conſiderable, Bonus odor lucri. The *vaſt* and ſweet *profits*, the large *Incoms* and *Revenues* which theſe bring to the Diſpenſers of them. This *Fabula meritorum*, (like that *Fabula Chriſti*, as one of their *Popes* ſaid, and he ſpake *like himſelf*) is not eaſily to be parted with. Methinks I hear their good Brother *Demetrius*, clapping them on the ſhoulder, and crying, *Euge, Macte*, Go on, *Noble Souls*, go on and proſper. Alas, *Silver Shrines* for the great *Diana* are in danger, yea her Holineſs her ſelf is in danger; and not ſhe, or not ſo much *ſhe*, as *we*, *Our Craft is in danger to be ſet at nought*, *Act.* 19. 24 *&c.*

Sol. Pardon me, if here I make no reply, but ingenuouſly confeſs, with that *Learned* and *Worthy Brother*, in his late excellent and *ſinewy* Tract on *Rom.* 8. that I cannot anſwer it. But, this being taken away, *I aſſure my ſelf*, ſaith he, *this Controverſie would ſoon be at an end.* 'Tis the ſatisfying of *corrupt men* in their *pride* and *avarice*, and filthy lucre, rather than the ſatisfying of a *puniſhing* God, that is at the bottom of this Controverſie. Dr. *Jacomb.*

Thus much as to the ſecond Romiſh Poſition.

III. *There*

III. *There have been*, say the Papists, *now are, and still will be in the Church some eminent and transcendent Saints*, such as the Virgin *Mary*, *John Baptist*, St. *Peter*, St. *Paul*, *Ignatius Loiola*, St. *Dominic*, St. *Francis*, and many signal Martyrs and Confessors, *that*, by the assisting Grace of God vouchsafed to them in this life, and the wise improvement of their own free-will, *have been enabled perfectly, and personally, and perpetually to keep the whole Law of God*; and by this, have merited Eternal Life for themselves, and greater degrees of Glory: Nay more, not only so, not only done *all the good which the Lord required*, or only just so much as the Law demanded; not only given the Lord good measure, pressed down, and shaken together, *but even running over*, i. e. by lending an obedient ear *to God's Evangelical Counsels*, which are things of greater moment by far with Papists, than God's Moral Precepts, they have even done *more than the Law demands*, more than was needful to be done by them for the obtaining of Eternal Salvation, and have suffered more grievous torments than their sin deserved: and *by both*, have most plentifully *merited* for others. The vanity and *rottenness* of this third suggestion, I suppose I have sufficiently evidenced in the proof of my *first* and *second* Proposition, and therefore hasten to the next Assertion of the Papists, which is,

Concil. Trid. sec. 6. c. 18. Bell. de Justif. lib. 4. c. 10.

IV. *These redundant and over-flowing meritorious actions and sufferings of eminent Saints, being mixed and jumbled together with the superabundant satisfaction of Christ*, (concerning which *Clement* 6th tells us, that one drop of Christ's Blood was sufficient for the Redemption of all Mankind, as if all the rest might have been well spared) *are*, say they, *deposited in the Churches hands as a common Stock and Treasury.*

Fifthly and lastly, *The Key of this Church-Treasury is committed by God to the whole and sole care and disposé of his Holiness the Pope himself*, the whole Treasury to be disposed of by him and his Delegates, and to be applied to poor, penitent, and contrite sinners, that so by the *Popes* Bull and *Indulgencies* they may enjoy the benefit of those merits, and be delivered either from *Church-Censures* on Earth, or the pains of *Purgatory*, next door to Hell.

To both these I shall briefly say but thus much, *Et risum teneatis amici?* or rather, *Quis talia fando temperet a Lachrymis?* This, this was the thing that first raised the Spirit of that *German Elijah*, to put his life into his hand, and in the strength of his God to go out against the *Romish Goliah*. Pope *Leo* had gratified his dear Sister *Magdalene* with a large *Monopoly* of *German* Pardons. *Aremboldus* her Factor was a little too covetous, and held the Market *too high*. The heighth of his over-rated Ware, caused the *Chapmen*, and among the rest, *Luther*, a little more *narrowly* to inspect their worth, and they were soon found to be, what indeed they are, a *novel*, and *irrational* vanity, an *upstart* Opinion; not known saith *Cornelius Agrippa*, *Polidore Virgil*, and *Machiavel*, to

Luther.

to the Churches, till the year 1300. in *Boniface* the Eighth his days, who was the first that extended Indulgencies to *Purgatory*, and the first that devised the *Jubilee*, which is indeed the *Mart* or Market for the full uttering of them.

But to let pass the *Novelty*, do but seriously weigh the *sinfulness* of this Opinion. 'Tis grounded on a supposed merit in Saints. Now *merit is that which purchaseth a thing* de novo, *which we had not before, and to make that due which one had not before, but may now lay just claim to.* If so, how deeply *derogatory* is this opinion to the fulness of Saints merit, to purchase all reconciliation and acceptation both of our persons and services, together with an everlasting Inheritance in the Kingdom of Heaven, *Dan.* 9. 24, 25, 26. *Col.* 1. 19, 20. *Joh.* 17. 2. *Heb.* 9. 12, 15. If the *merit of Christ* be of infinite value, and that by it he hath *purchased* in behalf of us his Members a *full right* unto eternal life and happiness, then their good works do not make the same newly due. If they make it any way due, either in whole, or in part: If in *whole*, then Christ hath merited nothing for them; if in *part*, then something of eternal life there is, which Christ hath not merited: either way there is a manifest *derogation* from the merits of Christ.

As for that *Ignis fatuus of Purgatory*, I refer you to the learned Labours of my *Reverend* Brother, that in this Book professedly treats of that subject.

I have done with the *self-advancing* Papist. A few words more to the *self-abhorring Reformed Protestant*, and I have done.

Use 2. *Exhortation.*

1. *Be sincerely careful to maintain and practise good works*, and that with all your *might*, even to the *end* of your days, *Tit.* 3. 8. *Dorcas* was full of good works, *Act.* 9. 36. Yea, *provoke one another to love, and to good works*, Heb. 10. 24. Let not this thought, *that you cannot*, when you have done all, *either merit, or supererogate* by them, tempt you to *neglect* the holy, faithful, humble, constant performance of them. Do them then, but do them *for necessary uses*, for the noble *ends* by God prescribed. Not for this end, as if by them to merit or supererogate; leave that design to the *Pharisaical* Papist. But *in all your Obedience*, active, passive, aim directly,

1. *At the evidencing of the truth, and liveliness of your faith*, Jam. 2. 18, 22. To *shew your faith by your works*. *Abraham*'s faith was *made perfect* by his works. Not as if *Abraham*'s faith received its worth, value and perfection from his works, but made perfect, *i. e. made known and discovered*, as God's *strength is said to be perfected in our weakness*. Or thus, his faith co-working with his obedience, was made perfect, *i. e. bettered and improved*, as the inward vigour of your spirits is *increased* by motion and exercise.

Opera non sunt causa, quod aliquis justus sit apud Deum, sed potius sunt manifestationes justitiæ. Aquin. 2 Cor. 12. 9.

2. At the manifestation of your thankfulness. Thus *David*, *Psal.* 116. 12, 13. *What shall I render unto the Lord for all his benefits* towards me?

me? *I will take the Cup of Salvation*, and call upon the Name of
1 Pet. 2, 9. Lord. To *shew forth the praises* of him, who hath called you ou
1 Pet. 1. 5, to 11. darkness into his marvellous light.

3. *At the strengthening of your assurances of God's special love towa you.* Hereby *ye shall know that you know him, if ye keep his Comma ments*, that in you verily the love of God may be perfected, *and t hereby you may know that you are in him*, 1 Joh. 2. 3, 5.

4. *At the edification of your Brethren, that your Zeal may provoke t many*, as that of the Brethren of *Achaia* did those of *Macedonia*, 2 C 9. 2. Let your *light so shine before men*, not that they may magn you, but *glorifie your Father which is in Heaven*, Mat. 5. 16.

5. *At the adorning of your profession of the Gospel, and stopping the mouths of adversaries*, Tit. 2. 5, 9, to 13. 1 Tim. 6. 1. 1 P 2. 15.

6. Chiefly and principally *at the Glory of God*, 1 Cor. 10. 31. your *Conversation be so honest*, that, whereas they speak against you evil doers, though their Corruptions accuse you, their Consciences m acquit you, *that they may by your good works which they shall behold, g rifie God in the day of visitation*, 1 Pet. 2. 12. Phil. 1. 11. Joh. 15 Glorifie God, I say, whose workmanship you are, *created in Christ Jus unto good works*, which God hath before ordained, that ye sho walk in them, *Ephes.* 2. 10. that so, *having your fruit unto holiness, may have the end*, or consequent, not the merit of your works, t *eternal life*, Rom. 6. 22.

2. As, when you have done all, you are but an unprofitable serva and therefore must not presume to come to God in the opinion of y own worthiness, *yet be not afraid to come to God because of your unw thiness*. The *worst* of men should not keep off from God because th are *unprofitable*, since the *best* cannot *profit* him. If we have done *m* it is *nothing* to the Lord; and if we have done *nothing*, it is *no ha* the Lord his doing *much* for us. God will not turn us back because bring him nothing; nay, he invites us to come without any thing, *I* 55. 1. *without money*, or money-worth.

3. When you have done all, and are most fully laden with go works, *beg earnestly of God to work and keep in you low and hum thoughts of your self, of all you do or suffer for him.* They, of wh God hath the *highest* thoughts, have the *meanest* thoughts of, and the lowest rate upon themselves. No man ever received a fairer *Cer ficate* from God than *Job* did, *Job* 1. 1, 8. *None like him in the earth, perfect and an upright man*; and yet no man could think or speak m *humbly*, and undervaluingly of himself than *Job* did, *Job* 42. 6. *abhors himself, and repents in dust and ashes:* And *Job* 9. 15. Wh though I were righteous, *yet would I not answer*, but I would ma supplication to my Judge. And *Vers.* 20, 21. Though I were perfe *yet would I not know my soul*, I would despise my life.

To make and keep thee *humble* under thy greateſt *attainments:* *Uſe 3. Direction.*

1. *Often look up and conſider the infinite purity and holineſs of God:* the more we *know* God, the more *humble* we are before him. *Job* 42. 5, 6. *Now mine eye hath ſeen thee*, i. having now a clearer and more glorious manifeſtation of thee to my ſoul than ever: I now perceiving thy pure Holineſs, Wiſdom, Faithfulneſs, Goodneſs, as if they were corporeal Objects, and I ſaw them with mine eye; on this very ſcore *abhorring my ſelf in duſt and aſhes.*

2. When thou haſt done all, *Remember ſtill, that thy ability to do good works is not at all from thy ſelf, but from the Spirit of Chriſt*, Joh. 15. 4, 5. 2 Cor. 3. 5. Ezek. 36. 26, 27. A continual *gale and influence* of the holy *Spirit* neceſſary to bring thy richly-laden Soul into its *Port*, *Phil.* 2. 13. and 4. 13.

3. When thou art at thy *Non ultra*, in thy very *Zenith* of attainable Excellencies here; *Remember that all thy acceptation at the hand of God, both as to perſon and performance, depends wholly and ſolely on the bleſſed Jeſus, and thy peculiar intereſt in him*, Epheſ. 1. 6. 1 Pet. 2. 5. Exod. 8. 28. Gen. 4. 4. Heb. 11. 4. and 13. 20, 21. 2 Cor. 8. 12. Heb. 6. 10. Mat. 25. 21, 23.

SERMON XVII.

The Popiſh Doctrine, which forbiddeth to Marry, is a Deviliſh and Wicked Doctrine. Mr Thomas Vincent

1 Tim. 4. 1, 2, and part of the 3 Verſe, *Now the Spirit ſpeaketh expreſly, that in the latter times ſome ſhall depart from the faith, giving heed to ſeducing ſpirits, and doctrines of devils, ſpeaking lyes in hypocriſie, having their conſciences ſeared with a hot iron,* Forbidding to Marry.

THe Church of *Rome* hath been in her day as famous and truly worthy of Renown, as any Church which we read of, either in Scripture or Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory: I mean in the Primitive days of Chriſtianity, whilſt ſhe retained her Primitive Faith and Purity. Her Fame was great and growing, even whilſt the Apoſtle *Paul* was alive, who writing unto her, giveth thanks unto God for her, *That her Faith was ſpoken of thorowout the whole World*, *Rom.* 1. 8. This Church had the advantage of being ſeated in the Miſtreſs-City of the Earth, where the Court then was of the chief Empire; unto which reſort being made from all parts of the World, the moſt of which at that time were ſubject and Tributary unto *Rome*; her Faith and Obedience unto the Goſpel of Chriſt ſo openly profeſſed, ſo generally known and taken notice of at home, was ſpread abroad, and carried far and near by ſtrangers in their return from *Rome* into their own Countries. Then the Church of *Rome* was truly Apoſtolical, *being built upon the Foundation of the Prophets and Apoſtles, Jeſus Chriſt himſelf being the chief corner ſtone*, Epheſ. 2. 20. And ſo long as ſhe kept this Foundation, her building was of Silver, Gold, precious Stones; ſo long ſhe did ſhine with true Luſtre and Glory. But in proceſs of time this ſo famous a Church did decline, and by degrees degenerate, ſo that at length ſhe became an infamous Apoſtatical Church, and the ſeat

of

of Antichrist himself, the greatest Enemy, next the Devil, which Christ hath in the World. When she left her Foundation, her glorious Building of purer Metals and precious Stones, was changed into infirm and course Building of Wood, Hay and Stubble, which is under the curse, and whose end is to be consumed with Fire: Then her Golden Head fell off, and was strangely metamorphosed into Feet of Iron and Clay, which the Stone hewen out of the Mountain without hands will dash to pieces.

This Defection and Apostacy of the Church of *Rome*, was foreseen, and foretold by the Apostle *Paul* in this Epistle to *Timothy*, as also most plainly in his second Epistle to the *Thessalonians*. In the Text he that runneth may read a true Description of the Apostate Church of *Rome*: *Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing Spirits, and Doctrines of Devils, speaking lyes in hypocrisie, having their Consciences seared with a hot Iron, forbidding to marry*, &c.

The Church of *Rome* doth assume to her self to be *The House of God, the Church of the living God, the Pillar and Ground of Truth*, spoken of Vers. 15. of the former Chapter. If it should be granted that she was so at the first, and when the Apostle did write this Epistle, although he spake not of her in particular then, but of the Christian Church in the general, of which she was a part; methinks since her Corruption and Apostasie, since her great Degeneration into Antichristianism, she might apply unto her self (sure I am that others do with firm reason) what is asserted and foretold in the Text, which in every particular is very applicable unto her. *Now the Spirit speaketh expressly.* By the Spirit, we are to understand the Spirit of God, who speaketh expressly by the mouth of this Apostle, a man full of the Holy Ghost, whereby he was infallibly guided in what he here writeth and foretelleth. Or the Spirit speaketh expressly, that is, in some other place of Divine Writ, saith Learned Mr. *Joseph Mede* upon the place: and he instanceth in *Dan.* 11. 36,37,38,39. which he interpreteth and accommodateth to this Scripture, *That in the latter times*; The latter times is sometimes taken for the last Age of the World, which includeth all the times of the Gospel; but I rather think by the latter times we are to understand the latter Age of the Christian Church, which must be removed some considerable time from the times of the Apostle, and so is suitable to the Apostasie of the Roman Church. *Some* shall depart, *&c.* Hereby, saith Mr. *Mede*, we are not to understand a small number, but only the exception of some particulars: thus *some* is of the same import with *many* in Scripture usage, *Joh.* 6. 60, 66, compared with 64. *Rom.* 11. 17. 1 *Cor.* 10. 7, 8, 9, 10. Some *shall depart from the Faith*, that is, they shall depart from the Doctrine of Faith, and thus the Papists do most grosly, as in many other, so particularly in their Doctrine of Justification by works, so corrupt, and contrary unto the Doctrine which this same Apostle

taught in his Epistle to the *Romans*. Or some shall depart from the Faith, that is, saith *Mede*, they shall break their Oath of Fidelity unto Christ, that in and through him alone they should approach and worship the Divine Majesty; and he interpreteth this Apostasie to signifie no other than Idolatry, according to the ordinary acceptation of the word in the Scripture, which the Church of *Rome* above all Churches is guilty of. *Giving heed to seducing Spirits, and Doctrines of Devils.* By seducing Spirits, saith *Calvin*, is meant false Prophets and Doctors, who boast of the Spirit of God, but are acted by Satan, who is a lying Spirit in their mouth, as 1 *King.* 22. 22. By Doctrines of Devils, saith the same Author, is meant the Devilish Doctrines of these Hellishly inspired false Prophets. *Prophetas aut Doctores intelligit, quos ideo sic nominat quia Spiritum jactant. Satan aliquando Spiritus est mendax in ore pseudo-Prophetarium, (Doctrinis Dæmoniorum) quod perinde est acsi dixisset, attendentes pseudo-Prophetis & Diabolicis eorum dogmatibus.* Calv. in locum. Thus the Papists are under strong delusions, in their giving heed unto, and belief of those Lyes, and false Doctrines at first forged by the Devils in Hell, and vented afterward by the Mouths and Pens of of their Ministers upon Earth. Mr. *Mede* interpreteth the διδασκαλίαι δαιμονίων, to be Doctrines not of Devils, which they are the Authors of, but of *Dæmons*, as the word signifieth, or concerning *Dæmons*, as the inferiour Deified Powers were called by the Gentiles, whom they thought a middle sort of Divine Powers between the Sovereign and Heavenly gods, and mortal men; whose office was to be Agents and Mediators between the Heavenly gods and men, whose original was the Deified Souls of worthy men after death, and some of a higher degree that never were imprisoned in Bodies, unto whom they consecrated Images, Pillars and Temples, adoring them there and their Reliques: And he telleth us, that the Doctrine of *Dæmons* comprehends in most expres manner the whole Idolatry of the Mystery of Iniquity, the Deifying and Invocating of Saints and Angels, (those middle Powers between God and mortal men) the bowing to Images, the worshipping of Crosses as new Idol-Columns, the adoring and tempting of Reliques, the worshipping of any other visible thing upon supposal of any Divinity therein; what Copy, saith he, was ever so like the example, as all this to the Doctrine of *Dæmons?* And is not this now fulfilled which was foretold, *Rev.* 11. That *the second and outmost Court of the Temple*, (which is the second state of the Christian Church) *together with the Holy City, should be trodden down, and over-trampled by the Gentiles* (that is, overwhelmed with the Gentiles Idolatry) *forty and two months?* The Parallel may be read at large in that ingenuous piece of Mr. *Mede*'s, called, *The Apostacy of the latter times*, upon this Text in *Timothy*; and I am very prone to think that he hath more fully expressed and explained the mind of the Holy Ghost in this place, than any that went before him.

The

The ſecond and third Verſes of this Chapter, do ſet forth the quality of the *perſons*, and the means whereby this defection ſhould enter, *ſpeaking lyes in hypocriſie*, or through the hypocriſie of Lyars, this the ſame Author applyeth to the Popiſh Doctrines, which hath obtained, 1. By Lyes of Miracles; 2. Fabulous Legends of the Acts of Saints, and ſufferings of Martyrs; 3. Counterfeit Writings under the name of the firſt and beſt Antiquity. *Having their Conſciences ſeared with a hot Iron.* And who, ſaith Mr. *Mede*, could have coined, or who could have believed ſuch monſtrous ſtuff as the Popiſh Legends are ſtuffed with, but ſuch as were cauterized, paſt all feeling and tenderneſs both of Conſcience and ſenſe it ſelf? *Forbidding to marry.* The applicableneſs of this to the Papiſts will appear in what I have now to ſay, and my Diſcourſe muſt be confined to the latter clauſe of the Text, *Forbidding to marry.* From which the Queſtion which I am to ſpeak unto is this, *Whether the Popiſh Doctrine which forbiddeth to marry be a deviliſh and wicked Doctrine?* This I affirm, and this, through God's help, I ſhall prove, and that my proceeding herein may be the more clear, I ſhall, 1. Show how far the Popiſh Doctrine doth forbid to marry: 2. Prove that their Doctrine which forbiddeth to marry, is a deviliſh wicked Doctrine: 3. Anſwer the Arguments which are brought for this Doctrine: Fourthly and laſtly, I ſhall ſhut up my Diſcourſe with ſome Uſes.

1. How far the Popiſh Doctrine forbiddeth to marry.

Firſt Negatively, this Doctrine doth not forbid all Marriage; and yet this I may truly ſay, that Popiſh Writers ſpeak ſo diſgracefully and contemptuouſly of Marriage in their Argumentations againſt the Marriage of ſome, that if all were true which they affirm, it would be unlawful for any as they hope for Salvation to link themſelves in the bonds of Matrimony.

Secondly and Poſitively, the Popiſh Doctrine forbiddeth the Marriage of the Clergy, particularly of Biſhops, Prieſts and Deacons, and of all that enter into Holy Orders: and not only of all thoſe men who are employed in the ſervice of the Church and Miniſtry, but alſo of all thoſe Women and Virgins who have vowed Continency, and have entred themſelves into Nunneries. Beſides what is generally aſſerted by the Popiſh Doctors who write of this point, the Canon of the Council of *Trent*, which the Papiſts univerſally do ſubſcribe unto, and own for infallible truth, is plainly this: *Ex octava Seſſione Trid. Con. Can. 9. Si quis dixerit, Clericos in ſacris Ordinibus conſtitutos, vel Regulares Caſtitatem ſolenniter profeſſos, poſſe Matrimonium contrahere, contractumque validum eſſe, non obſtante lege Eccleſiaſtica vel voto, & oppoſitum nil aliud eſſe quam damnare Matrimonium, poſſeque omnes contrahere Matrimonium, qui non ſentiunt ſe caſtitatis (etiamſi eam voverint) habere Donum; Anathema ſit; cum Deus id recte petentibus non deneget, nec patiatur nos ſupra id quod poſſumus tentari.* "If any ſay, that the Clergy, who have

"received

" received holy Orders, or Regulars who have solemnly professed Cha-
" stity, may contract Marriage, and that such contract (notwithstand-
" ing the Ecclesiastical Law and their own Vow) is valid; and that the
" contrary Assertion is no other than to condemn Marriage; and that all
" (although they have vowed Chastity) may contract Marriage that do
" not find they have the gift of Chastity. Let him be accursed; for as
" much as God will not deny this gift unto those who rightly seek it,
" neither will he suffer us to be tempted above what we are able.

The Popish Ecclesiastical Laws admit none into sacred Orders before they solemnly vow Chastity, or (as they interpret it) abstaining from Marriage: And it is required of Nuns that they solemnly vow to preserve and persevere unto death in their Virginity, or single estate, without any regard unto any unforeseen necessity for Marriage; and amongst all the Dispensations that are granted by the Pope, amongst all the Indulgencies which he makes sale of, to allow grosly moral evils, absolutely forbidden by the Lord, no Dispensations or Indulgencies are granted by him for the Marriage of such as are under this Celibate Vow, although they are not able to contain, and although God doth command such to marry. I shall do the Papists no wrong in saying that they account it a greater crime for Ecclesiastical Persons to marry, than for them to commit Fornication or Sodomy. The learned *Chamier* doth give several instances of Popish Writers to this purpose, *viz. Hosius*, who *doth defend the saying of* Pighius *as not only true, but pious, that a Priest through the infirmity of the flesh falling into the sin of Fornication, doth sin less than if he should marry; and telleth us, that although this Assertion seem foul, yet the Catholicks account it most honest. Reprehenditur Pighius qui non vere magis, quam pie, scriptum reliquit, minus peccare Sacerdotem, qui ex infirmitate carnis in Fornicationem sit prolapsus; quam qui nuptias contraxit, Turpis videtur hæc oratio, contra, Catholicis honestissimum.* Hosius Confessionis capite 56. *Costerus*, who *doth assert that a Priest who doth fornicate or nourish a Concubine at home in his house, although he be guilty of great Sacriledge, yet he doth more heinously offend if he contract Matrimony. Sacerdos si fornicetur, aut domi Concubinam foveat, tametsi gravi Sacrilegio se obstringat; Gravius tamen peccat, si contrahat Matrimonium.* Costerus de Lætib. Sacerd. Cardinal *Campegio*, who *doth aver, that for Priests to become Husbands, is by far a more heinous crime than if they should keep many Whores in their houses. Quod Sacerdotes fiant mariti multo esse gravius peccatum, quam si plurimas domi meretrices alant.* Cardin. Campeg. apud Sleidan. Commentar. Libro Quarto. *Matthias Aquensis*, who *doth profess his opinion, that such who marry after their Vow of Continency, do offend more than such a one as through Humane frailty doth deviate*, (as he terms it) which in plain English is, who through the power of burning lust is unclean *with a hundred divers persons. Qui post continentiæ votum, devovet potestatem corporis cuivis mulieri magis offendit, quam iste qui humana fragilitate de-*

viaret

viaret cum centum diverſis perſonis. Matthias Aquenſis. Our *Molinæus* telleth us, *that by the Rules of the Roman Church, a Sodomiſt may exerciſe the Prieſthood, and by that abominable vice doth not run into irregularity; whereas Marriage is judged altogether incompatible with ſacred Orders:* and he quotes *Navarrus*, ſaying, *The crime of Sodomy is not comprehended amongſt the crimes that bring irregularity*, and giveth ſeveral reaſons for it. *Molin. Novelty of Popery, Book 7. Chap. 5.* And no wonder, when *John Caſa* Archbiſhop of *Benevent*, and Dean of the Apoſtolical Chamber, printed a Book at *Venice* in defence of Sodomy. *Sleidan* ſaith that he *wrote a Sodomitical Book, than which nothing more foul could have been thought upon by man; neither did he bluſh to celebrate with praiſes that moſt filthy ſin, too much known in* Italy *and* Greece. *Ille quem diximus, Archiepiſcopus Beneventanus, libellum conſcripſit plane Cinædum, & qui nihil fœdius excogitari poſſit; nec enim puduit eum, ſcelus omnium longe turpiſſimum, ſed per Italiam nimis notum, atque Græciam, celebrare laudibus.* Sleidan. Com. Lib. 11. p. 652. This was that *Caſa* by whom *Francis Spira* was ſeduced to revolt from his Profeſſion, the cauſe of ſuch hideous terrours of Conſcience afterward, and ſo miſerable an end. It is evident then that the Marriage of the Clergy, and of all under the Celebate Vow, is forbidden by the Popiſh Doctrine.

2. The ſecond thing is, to prove that the Popiſh Doctrine which forbiddeth the Marriage of the Clergy, and of all under the Celibate Vow, is a deviliſh wicked Doctrine; and this I ſhall do by ſeveral Arguments.

Arg. 1. That Doctrine which is a falſe Doctrine, and contrary unto the Word of God, is a deviliſh wicked Doctrine: But the Popiſh Doctrine which forbiddeth the Marriage of the Clergy, and of all under the Celibate Vow, is a falſe Doctrine, and contrary unto the Word of God: Therefore it is deviliſh and wicked.

All ſuch Doctrine as is falſe, is deviliſh, the Devil being the Father of Lyes, eſpecially of lying falſe Doctrine, whereby he doth blind the eyes of them which believe not, and corrupt the minds of them who are his Children and followers; likewiſe that Doctrine which is contrary unto the Word of God, is of the Devil, who is the greateſt Enemy which the Word of God hath, becauſe of the great miſchief which the Word of God hath done to his Cauſe, and the Intereſt of his Kingdom. And be ſure that all ſuch Doctrine as is deviliſh, is wicked; the Devil being ſuch a foul and wicked Spirit, as is wholly void and empty of all moral good, and from whom nothing but wickedneſs doth proceed.

If there be any queſtion, it will be of the minor Propoſition, which is this, That the Popiſh Doctrine which forbiddeth the marriage of the Clergy, and of all under the Celibate Vow, is a falſe Doctrine, and contrary unto the Word of God. I need no other proof that it is falſe, than that it is contrary unto the Word of God; this Word proceeding from

from the Fountain of Light and Truth, I mean, from God who is all Light, and with whom dwelleth no Darkness at all, who is Truth it self, and with whom it is impossible any lye or mistake should be found. The chief thing then that is to be proved is this, That this Popish Doctrine is contrary unto the Word of God. And this will appear in that,

1. This Doctrine forbiddeth that which the Word of God alloweth:
2. This Doctrine forbiddeth that which the Word of God in some case commandeth.

1. The Popish Doctrine which forbiddeth the Marriage of the Clergy, and of all under the Celibate Vow, forbiddeth that which the Word of God alloweth. And this is evident in that,

1. The Word of God alloweth Marriage, and maketh no exception of the Clergy, or any under the Celibate Vow. That which God did at first institute and appoint, surely the Word of God doth allow: Marriage being God's Ordinance, none will deny that it hath God's allowance; and that the Word of God maketh no exception of the Clergy, or any under the Celibate Vow, is plain, because the Popish Writers can bring no Scripture in the whole Bible which maketh such exception; no Scripture that doth this directly, is urged by any of them: what firm Scripture-consequence they may plead, will be seen when we come to speak to their Arguments for this Doctrine. In the mean time it may be evident unto all, that the Scripture alloweth the Marriage of all, without such exceptions as the Papists make, by one clear Scripture which admitteth of no contradiction by any other, *Heb.* 13. 4. *Marriage is honourable in all, and the bed undefiled; but Whoremongers and Adulterers God will judge.* All that are unclean without Marriage, such as Whoremongers; all that defile the Marriage-bed, such as Adulterers, are guilty of a shameful and great God-provoking sin, for which God will judge them, (if they before do not make their peace with him, and forsake such wicked practices) and punish them everlastingly in Hell: But Marriage is honourable, and therefore lawful; and that not only in some, but in all without any exception.

2. The Word of God is so far from excepting the Marriage of the Clergy, that it doth plainly allow the Marriage of such persons.

1. In the Old Testament-times the Prophets, Priests, Levites, and all those which attended more immediately the service of God, and at the Altar under the Law, were allowed to marry. *Abraham*, who was a Prophet and Priest in his own house, did not take *Sarah* to be his Wife without God's allowance, otherwise surely God would not have so signally owned his Marriage, as to make promise of the blessed Seed unto him hereby. *Rebecca* was a Wife of God's chusing for *Isaac*. God never blamed *Moses*, that great Prophet, for marrying *Zipporah*; neither was *Aaron* faulty because he had his Wife and Children. *Isaiah*, that Evangelical Prophet, was married, and had Children too in the time of his Prophecy, which the Scripture in the recording of it doth not

not impute to him for any iniquity. The Prieſts and Levites generally did marry; and however ſome of them are reproved in Scripture for divers ſins, yet Matrimony is never in the leaſt charged upon them for any crime. If then ſuch, whoſe office and employment under the Law was to adminiſter about holy things, did marry, and might do it without any ſin againſt God: by parity of reaſon, Miniſters and all thoſe of the Clergy, who adminiſter about holy things in the times of the Goſpel, have allowance and liberty without any offence to God to make uſe of Marriage. The reply of the Papiſts is frivolous, and ſcarce worth mentioning: the chief thing that they reply unto, is concerning the Marriage of the Prieſts and Levites, who, they ſay, had their courſes to attend the ſervice of the Temple and Altar, and that then they were to ſeparate from their Wives, which was at that time as if they had none: whereas the Clergy now are to attend the ſervice of God in their work continually, and therefore ought to abſtain from Marriage altogether. But beſides that they can never prove that the Prieſts and Levites did ſeparate from their Wives in the time of their courſes; what will they ſay unto the Marriage of thoſe Prieſts and Levites, who continually and daily did adminiſter at the Altar before the diviſion of them into courſes, namely, before the time of *David*?

2. In the New Teſtament times Miniſters have a plain and expreſs allowance to marry, as will appear by two or three places of Scripture.

The firſt Scripture which doth allow the Marriage of Miniſters, is 1 *Cor.* 9. 5. *Have we not power to lead about a Siſter, a Wife, as well as other Apoſtles, and as the Brethren of the Lord, and Cephas?* The words are written by the Apoſtle *Paul*, who himſelf was an unmarried man, as he telleth the *Corinthians* in the ſeventh Chapter of this Epiſtle; yet in this Chapter and Verſe he doth aſſert his power which he lawfully might have taken to lead about a Siſter, a Wife, which in another phraſe is the ſame as if he had ſaid, to marry: And he giveth inſtance in the uſe which others of his Function had made of their power, not only other Miniſters, but other Apoſtles, yea and the chiefeſt of the Apoſtles, the Brethren of the Lord, and *Cephas*, that is, *Peter* himſelf, of whoſe Wife and Marriage the Scripture doth take notice of in more than one place. If then ſome of the Apoſtles did marry, and the other Apoſtles had power to do the like, then any Miniſters of the Goſpel have the ſame power and allowance to marry: this conſequence is plain and undeniable, becauſe the Apoſtles were Miniſters of the Goſpel; and what was lawful for them as Miniſters, is lawful for any other Miniſters; and it is as plain in this Scripture that ſome of the Apoſtles did marry, and that others had power to do the like. The great exception of the Papiſts againſt this Scripture, is, that this word tranſlated Wife is γυναῖκα, which they ſay ſignifieth a Woman, and therefore that the leading about a Woman doth not imply Marriage: and they interpret the meaning of this

place, that the Apostles had power to lead about Women to be helpers to them, as our Saviour had Women following of him, who did minister unto him. But besides that the ordinary signification of this word is Wife, it may be evident to an unprejudiced mind, that it must signifie Wife, and nothing else in this place, because of the word Sister used before it, of which the word γυναῖκα is exegetical, or explainatory: for all truly believing Women being Sisters, that the Apostle might be understood what kind of Sister he speaketh of, he addeth γυναῖκα, which cannot be interpreted with good sense *Woman*, unless there had been Sisters who were Men and not Women. How could the Sister whom the Apostle had power to lead about, be distinguished from other Sisters whom he did not lead about? were they not Women as well as she? Therefore the signification must needs be Wife, and hereby the Sister he had power to lead about is distinguished from all other Sisters whom he did not marry. If any should further reply, that supposing the word γυναῖκα to signifie Wife, the Apostle might speak not of taking a Wife himself, but of leading about the Wife of another to be his helper. I answer, That the Apostle speaketh of something wherein he had power, and which he did not make use of, and this in reference unto Women was Marriage: but as to other Women, he did lead some about, and they were helpers unto him; as for instance, *Priscilla*, who with her Husband *Aquila* sailed with *Paul* into *Syria*, *Act.* 18. 18. and he calleth them *his helpers in Christ*, Rom. 16. 3. and in the second Verse of the same Chapter he commendeth *Phebe* to the *Romans*, because she had been *the succourer of many, and of himself also*; and Verse 6. he greeteth *Mary, who had bestowed much labour on him.* The Apostle then frequently making use of the help of other Women, and here speaking of the power which he had to lead about a Sister, a Wife, which he did not make use of, it must be needs understood of his leading about a Wife of his own, or of his Marriage, when the Apostle saith, *Have we not power to lead about a Sister, a Wife?* Two things are implyed: 1. That he did not lead about a Sister, a Wife; that is, that he did not marry, for he had Sisters to be his helpers as hath been shewn. 2. That he had power to lead about a Sister, a Wife, or that it was lawful for him to marry; this Interrogative implying a strong Affirmative; and this power which he had he proveth by the Marriage of other Apostles, and expresly of *Peter:* for if the great Apostle of the *Jews*, which was *Peter*, was married; then the great Apostle of the *Gentiles*, which was *Paul*, might marry too: and if the Apostles themselves, the most eminent Ministers, might marry; then it is lawful for any other Ministers to do it, who are their Successors in the Ministerial work.

Another Scripture which giveth allowance to the Marriage of Ministers, is *Tit.* 1. 6. *If any be blameless, the Husband of one Wife, having faithful Children, not accused of riot or unruly.* The Apostle is here speaking of the Elders or Ministers which were to be ordained in every City,

City, as in the former Verſe; and in this Verſe he ſheweth how ſuch as are Miniſters ſhould be qualified, *If any be blameleſs, the Husband of one Wife, having faithful Children:* here the Qualification of *blameleſs* is uſed in Conjunction with *the Husband of a Wife*, and the *Father of Children*, in the perſon of a Miniſter. It is evident then that a married Miniſter may be blameleſs; and one that is a Spiritual Father, may be a Natural Father too without any offence unto God. Indeed if a Miniſter ſhould have had at that time two Wives together, as the cuſtom of the Jews was of old, this would have been offenſive unto God; but to be the Husband of one Wife then, was, and ſtill is inoffenſive in Miniſters.

The third Scripture is like unto this, 1 *Tim.* 3. 2. *A Biſhop muſt be blameleſs, the Husband of one Wife*, &c. Verſ. 4, 5. *One that ruleth well his own Houſe, having his Children in ſubjection with all gravity: (For if a man know not how to rule his own Houſe, how ſhall he take care of the Church of God?)* Verſ. 11. *Even ſo muſt their Wives be grave, not ſlanderers, ſober, faithful in all things.* Verſ. 12. *Let the Deacons be Husbands of one Wife, ruling their Children and their own Houſes well.* It was not without ſpecial Providence that Miniſters ſhould have this Qualification affixed once and again unto them in their Function, that they muſt be *Husbands of one Wife*; which is not ſo to be underſtood, as if they muſt of neceſſity be Husbands, or elſe they muſt not be Miniſters; but that if they be Husbands it muſt be but of one Wife at one time: ſo that though the Scripture doth not command all of them to marry, yet it doth not forbid any, but alloweth every Miniſter to marry, ſo that he taketh not many, or more than one Wife at a time. The Papiſts are forced to wink hard to keep out the light of theſe places, and they are greatly put to it to find out ſhifts for the evading the plain and clear truth, that Miniſters have allowance by theſe Scriptures to marry. Some of them expound the meaning of the words, *The Husband of one Wife*, to ſignifie the Paſtoral charge of one Church, unto which a Miniſter hath relation as a Husband to his Wife: but this cannot be the meaning, becauſe the Apoſtle doth here diſtinguiſh between the Houſe of the Miniſter where he is the Husband of one Wife, from the Church of God; and the Children of the Miniſter by this one Wife which he is to rule over, cannot be underſtood of Spiritual Children, but of Natural Children, as is plain in the fourth and fifth Verſes; *One that ruleth well his own Houſe, having his Children in ſubjection with all gravity: (For if a man know not how to rule his own Houſe, how ſhall he take care of the Church of God?)* Others interpret the words, *The Husband of one Wife*, to be meant of what the Miniſter to be choſen was before he entereth into this ſacred Function, not that he hath liberty for one Wife after he engageth in the Miniſtry; and therefore the Papiſts, if they admit any married perſons to this high Function, they force them to abandon their Wives. But this cannot be the meaning of the Apoſtle,

because he speaketh not of such who have been the Husbands of one Wife, but of those that are so: and as they must be blameless, vigilant, sober, and retain the other Qualifications there required after they are Ministers; so they may retain their Wives too, there being not the least hint given in this Scripture, or any else, that Ministers must put away their Wives when they become Ministers. Amongst the causes of Divorce in the Scripture, this be sure is none; and when God hath joined Ministers and their Wives together, what Humane power may lawfully put them asunder? Yea, on the contrary the Apostle supposeth in this place that Ministers should live with their Wives, by his Directions, 1. In general, in reference to their own Houses, of which the Wife as well as the Children are a part, whom he would have to rule well. 2. In particular, in reference to their Wives, whose Qualifications he sets down, that they should be *grave, not slanderers, sober, faithful in all things*, that they might be the more meet helpers of their Husbands in their Work, and the better Examples to the Flock; and sure then this doth imply that Ministers may, yea ought to live with their Wives after they become Ministers. Thus the Popish Doctrine forbiddeth that which the Word of God doth allow.

2. The Popish Doctrine which forbiddeth the Marriage of the Clergy, and all under the Celibate Vow, forbiddeth that which the Word of God in some cases doth command. And the case is this: When single or unmarried persons, although they apprehend that they might bring most Glory unto God in their single estate, upon supposition that they had the gift of Continency; yet really do find themselves to be without this gift, after they have earnestly prayed unto God for it, after fasting, self-denial, watchfulness, and diligent use of all means to keep under their body, and notwithstanding all this they do feel in themselves such burning lusts as do defile their minds, disturb them in the service of God, and endanger their commission of the sin of fornication as they have opportunity for it, and meet with any temptation unto it; in such a case it is the express command of God that such persons should marry for the quenching of those burning lusts, and the preventing of that filthy and abominable sin of fornication. This is plain, 1 *Cor.* 7. 1, 2. *It is good for a man not to touch a woman: Nevertheless to avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband.* If the man be in danger of fornication, let him have his own wife; if the woman be in danger, let her have her own husband; and when is it that they are in danger? it is when they cannot contain, this supposeth the use of means, otherwise the word would not have been *cannot contain*, Vers. 8, 9. *I say therefore unto the unmarried and widows, It is good for them if they abide even as I: But if they cannot contain, let them marry; for it is better to marry than to burn.* Now this may be, and too too often is the case of some of the Clergy, and others under the Celibate Vow; all which persons, without the exception of this

this caſe, the Popiſh Doctrine doth forbid to marry; therefore the Popiſh Doctrine is contrary unto the Word of God, in forbidding that which the Word of God commandeth. I know the Canon of the Council of *Trent*, to evade the force of this Scripture, doth aſſert, *That God will not deny this gift of Continency unto thoſe who rightly ſeek it; neither will he ſuffer us to be tempted above what we are able.* Unto which I anſwer, That God will not deny any gift which he hath promiſed unto thoſe that rightly ſeek it: But the Papiſts will never prove, while their eyes are open, that God hath abſolutely promiſed the gift of Continency unto all thoſe that diligently and moſt rightly ſeek it. Whatever gifts are neceſſary unto Salvation, God hath abſolutely promiſed unto thoſe that rightly ſeek them: But this gift of Continency in a ſingle eſtate is not numbred by the Scripture, and therefore ought not to be ſo by any amongſt thoſe gifts: for if ſo, then none could be ſaved that are without it; and hence it would follow, that all who are married ſhould certainly be damned, which the Papiſts themſelves will not affirm. This gift of Continency God doth beſtow upon ſome of his Children, but not upon all his Children: when the Diſciples ſay unto our Saviour, *Matth.* 19. 10. *If the caſe of the man be ſo with his wife, it is not good to marry*; our Saviour anſwereth, Verſ. 11. *All men cannot receive this ſaying, ſave they unto whom it is given.* And the Apoſtle ſpeaking of this gift, telleth us, 1 *Cor.* 7. 7. *I would that all men were even as I my ſelf*, (that is, unmarried) *but every man hath his proper gift of God, one after this manner, and another after that.* By *all men*, which our Saviour ſpeaketh of, and *every man*, which the Apoſtle *Paul* ſpeaketh of, we are to underſtand not all and every one of the Children of the World, but all and every one of the Children of God; all thoſe cannot receive the ſaying to be without Marriage. When God in Converſion doth work a change in their Souls, he doth not alter the Conſtitution of their Bodies; and there are ſome both Men and Women, although truly religious, yet are of ſuch Conſtitution of Body that they cannot contain without Marriage, they cannot receive the ſaying to be without marrying, and withal without burning. Some of God's Children have a proper gift of God to live chaſtly in a ſingle eſtate, and others have a proper gift of God to live chaſtly only in a married eſtate. If then the gift of Continency be not a gift which God hath in common promiſed unto all his Children that rightly ſeek it, as it is plain that it is not, then the Council of *Trent* doth aſſert a falſhood, That God will not deny this gift unto all that rightly ſeek it, if they mean by rightly ſeeking, diligently ſeeking, for God often-time doth deny it unto ſuch ſeekers: if they mean by rightly ſeeking, ſeeking in faith, I deny that any can ſeek this gift in faith abſolutely, becauſe there is no abſolute promiſe of it; and ſo it is true, that God will not deny this gift to thoſe that rightly ſeek it; and it is falſe, that any can ſeek it rightly, that is, in faith, abſolutely.

What

What the Council doth further assert, *That God will not suffer us to be tempted above what we are able*, is true, because it is the express Word of God: but it is not rightly applyed here. God will not suffer his Children to be tempted above what they are able, by affliction; neither will he suffer them to be tempted above what they are able unto sin, no not to the sin of fornication; but then it must be understood upon supposition that they make use of all lawful means for the prevention of this sin, and one both lawful and commanded means is Marriage, without which some of them may be tempted above what they are able unto it, so as to be overtaken by it, and live in the practice of it.

I have done with the first Argument, which being the chiefest and most comprehensive, I have been the largest in the handling of; I shall be more brief in the rest.

Arg. 2. That Doctrine which under the shew of Piety doth lead unto much lewdness and villany, is a deviliſh wicked Doctrine: But the Popish Doctrine which forbiddeth the Marriage of the Clergy, and of all under the Celibate Vow, under the shew of Piety doth lead unto much lewdness and villany: Therefore this Doctrine is a deviliſh and wicked Doctrine.

Whatever it be that leadeth unto much lewdness and villany, is deviliſh and wicked, 1 *John* 3. 8. *He that committeth sin is of the Devil*, he is lead to it by the Devil: he is of the Devil, that is, he is a servant of the Devil, or a Child of the Devil, *Joh.* 8. 44. *Ye are of your father the Devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do.* But when any are lead unto much lewdness and villany under the shew of piety, they are lead by the Devil hereunto more especially; therefore that Doctrine which under the shew of piety doth lead unto much lewdness and villany, must needs be a deviliſh wicked Doctrine. That such is the Popish Doctrine, is evident.

1. The Popish Doctrine which forbiddeth the Marriage of the Clergy, and of all under the Celibate Vow, hath a shew in it of piety; the pretence of such prohibition is, that these persons forbidden to marry might be the more mortified, chaste and holy, that they might be the more free from worldly cares, and more at liberty to addict themselves unto the service of the Lord without distraction. Here is a fair shew of piety, not in an ordinary, but in an eminent degree.

2. This Popish Doctrine doth lead unto much lewdness and villany, namely, unto Fornication, Adultery, Incest, Sodomy, Murder, and the like lewd practices, which have been the product of this prohibition to marry. But because I would not have this Argument swell bigger than the former, I shall reserve the proof of this to the Use of Information concerning the deviliſh wickedness of the Popish Church.

Object. If it be said, That there are and have been many of the Popish Clergy eminent for their Chastity. That the uncleanness of some

cannot

cannot be charged upon the generality. That whatever lewdneſs any of them have been guilty of, it is not the proper effect of this prohibition, but proceedeth from the wickedneſs of mans heart. I anſwer.

Anſw. 1. Some may be eminent for Chaſtity in the eſteem of men, that ſecretly are guilty of the baſeſt filthineſs in the ſight of God; and ſuch of them as really do abſtain from groſſer pollutions, ſome may thank their Conſtitution more than their Vow that they are reſtrained. But if it ſhould be granted, that ſome few of them do deny themſelves, and keep under their bodies that they may poſſeſs their veſſels in ſanctification; yet this doth not invalidate the Argument drawn from the woful effect which this prohibition to marry hath upon ſo many others.

2. If we cannot charge the generality of the Popiſh Clergy with the groſſer ſins of Adultery, Fornication, Sodomy, and the like; yet why may we not without breach of Charity imagine that their own Conſciences will charge them ſufficiently herewith, 1. When the moſt of ſuch ſins which are committed by them are done in ſecret. 2. When ſo many of thoſe ſins are come to light, and their own Hiſtorians do accuſe them thereof. 3. When ſo many of their Popes themſelves, their Fathers and Examples, have been guilty ſo groſly. 4. When Indulgencies for Stews, for Sodomy, for Prieſts keeping Concubines, have been ſo generally granted. 5. When their Principles do encourage unto ſuch ſins. All which I ſhall make-evident in the Uſe.

3. It is true, that the lewdneſs of the Popiſh Clergy doth primarily proceed from the wickedneſs of their own hearts; and it is as true, that their prohibition to marry doth lead unto this lewdneſs. If a River have but two Chanels to run in, he that dammeth up and ſtoppeth the courſe of the River in one of theſe Chanels, may be ſaid to lead the River into the other Chanel: Even ſo, when the Conſtitution of ſome mens bodies is ſuch, that their burning deſires will have their courſe and vent, and cannot be quenched except by Matrimony or by Adultery, either by their own Wives, or by ſtrange Women; ſuch as prohibit Marriage, and cut off the uſe of the only remedy in ſome perſons againſt Adultery or Fornication, they do lead hereby unto the practice of theſe abominable ſins, and others as abominable, which are the attendants or conſequents of them.

Arg. 3. That Doctrine which forbiddeth the Marriage of any, that hereby they may merit the Kingdom of Heaven, is a deviliſh wicked Doctrine: But the Popiſh Doctrine which forbiddeth the Marriage of the Clergy, and of all under the Celibate Vow, forbiddeth the Marriage of ſuch, that hereby they may merit the Kingdom of Heaven. This will appear by what *Chemnitius* doth aſſert and prove out of their own Writings: *Pontificii quando de cauſa finali Virginitatis, ſeu cælibatus diſputant, quo concilio, quo fine & propter quam cauſam ſuſcipiendus vel ſervandus*

servandus est cælibatus, palam docent, Ideo suscipiendum & servandum esse cælibatum quia sit satisfactio pro peccatis, & meritum salutis & vitæ æternæ. Albertus Pighius in Controversia 14. *de votis Monasticis exertis verbis dicit. Illa eligimus ea opinione & confidentia, quia existimamus illis Dei gratiam & benevolentiam promereri. Item Monastice assumitur a profitentibus quia creditur valere ad satisfactionem pro peccatis. Petrus a Soto in Confessione sua Catholica dicit. Virginitatem seu Cælibatum, coram Dei tribunali magni meriti, quia sit satisfactio peccatorum maxima & meritum vitæ æternæ.* Chemnic. Exam. Conc. Trid. Sess. 8. cap. 1. In quibus Cas. &c. p. 9, 10. Item p. 11. *Fingunt Pontificii se per Cælibatum supererogare; Ideo Conjugium vocant statum Imperfectionis, Cælibatum vero statum perfectionis, & propter illam persuasionem sui merita & supererogationis opera vendunt, communicant & applicant aliis qui sunt in statu imperfectionis. Hinc Bernhardinus fingit Monachos & Sanctimoniales substantialibus suis votis non pro suis tantum peccatis, verum etiam pro fundatorum, & aliorum benefactorum peccatis satisfacere. The Papists* (saith he) *when they dispute concerning the final cause of Virginity, or the Celibate Vow, for what end, and for what cause it should be taken and kept, they openly teach, That therefore this should be done, because it is satisfaction for sin, and doth merit Salvation and eternal life.* And he citeth *Pighius*, saying, *That such Vows do merit God's grace and favour, that they are of force to satisfie for sins.* And *Petrus a Soto* in these words, *That Virginity, or the Celibate state, is of great merit before God's Tribunal, because it is the greatest satisfaction for sins, and doth merit eternal life.* And he telleth us, *the Papists feign by this Celibate state, that they supererogate, and that therefore they call the Conjugal state a state of imperfection, but the Celibate state a state of perfection, and their meritorious works they sell and apply to others.* And he citeth *Bernhardinus*, who doth affirm, *That Monks and others under this Celibate Vow, do satisfie hereby not only for their own sins, but also for the sins of their Founders and other Benefactors.*

Now the Doctrine of Merit in man of eternal life, is devilish and wicked; which will necessarily infer that the Doctrine which introduceth this, and which propoundeth this as its chief motive and inducement, is devilish and wicked too.

That the Doctrine of Merit in man of eternal life, is devilish and wicked, I shall shew in three Propositions. 1. It is devilish and wicked to assert that any really good works which God hath commanded, are meritorious of eternal life. 2. It is much more devilish and wicked to say, that works of supererogation, such as the Papists make this Celibate Vow to be, are thus meritorious. 3. It is most of all devilish and wicked to assert the Celibate Vow (which really is, especially to some, a great sin) to be thus meritorious.

1. It is devilish and wicked to assert that any really good works which God commandeth are meritorious of eternal life; because, 1. This leadeth

leadeth back unto the Covenant of Works. 2. This proceedeth from ignorance. 3. This leadeth unto pride and boaſting. 4. This caſteth a diſparagement upon the Merits of the Lord Jeſus Chriſt.

1. This leadeth back unto the Covenant of Works, the Tenour of which is, *Do this and live.* Such as hope for life for any really good works which they do, they fall off from the Covenant of Grace, and they fall back unto the Covenant of Works, which will prove altogether inſufficient for life unto any in their lapſed eſtate, *Gal.* 3. 21. *If there had been a Law given which could have given life, verily righteouſneſs ſhould have been by the Law.* Therefore ſuch are bewitched by the Devil and his Inſtruments, who, forſaking the way of life which God hath appointed by the promiſes of Grace in the Goſpel, do look for life by any of the works of the Law. And hence it is that the Apoſtle in the beginning of this Chapter doth blame the *Galatians* for their folly and faſcination in their ſeeking righteouſneſs and life by the merit of any works; and he proveth by ſeveral Arguments that this was attainable only by Faith.

2. This proceedeth from ignorance: ſuch as hold really good works to be meritorious of eternal life, they are either ignorant of the imperfection of ſuch works, or they are ignorant of God who requireth the moſt abſolute and exact perfection in the works, for the ſake of which he will give eternal life. Such as do not ſee the defects and imperfections of their beſt works, are unacquainted with themſelves, and the ſtrictneſs of God's Law; and they, who are without the Spirit to diſcern this, their works (whatever they may think of them) are ſo far from being perfect, that they are not really, ſpiritually and acceptably good in the ſight of God: And ſuch who imagine a meritorioufneſs in imperfectly good works, in works mingled with ſin, (as the beſt works of the beſt men ſince the fall are) they are unacquainted with the infinite Holineſs and Righteouſneſs of God, which would engage him to puniſh the moſt holy men for the ſins of their moſt holy performances, had they not intereſt in the perfect Righteouſneſs of Chriſt by Faith. But the god of this World (namely, the Devil) hath ſo far blinded the eyes of his Children the Papiſts, as to keep them ignorant both of God and themſelves too, in his perſwading them that any of their works are meritorious of eternal life.

3. This leadeth unto pride and boaſting, *Rom.* 3. 27. *Where is boaſting? it is excluded. By what Law? of works? Nay, but by the Law of Faith.* Chap. 4. 2. *For if Abraham were juſtified by works, he hath whereof to glory.* Such as aſſert the meritorioufneſs of life in really good works, they aſſert Juſtification by ſuch works, there being a Concatenation between the one and the other; and hence doth ariſe boaſting, and the glorying of pride, which ſin being the Condemnation of the Devil, he is the great Promoter of it, and Prompter unto it in his Subjects the Papiſts, by filling them with arrogant thoughts of the meritorioufneſs

riousneſs of their works, whereby they ſacrifice to their own Nets, and rob God of the Glory which is due to his Name.

4. This caſteth a diſparagement upon the Merits of the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, as if there were either no Merit, or but an imperfect Merit of eternal life in his Righteouſneſs. If Chriſt's perfect Righteouſneſs be alone meritorious of eternal life and happineſs, (as the truth is) then there is no need of our Righteouſneſs to merit this life; although there be need upon other accounts, namely, by way of gratitude to the Lord, by way of evidence to our ſelves of our ſincerity, and to prepare us for eternal life. But if our Righteouſneſs or good works (however imperfect) are meritorious of eternal life, (as the Papiſts affirm) then there is no need of Chriſt's Merit and Righteouſneſs, and the Papiſts could well enough ſpare him, ſuppoſing they might be happy by the merit of their own good works. But I queſtion whether Chriſt will ſpare them in another ſenſe, when he cometh to reckon with them for the contumelies and diſparagements which they have caſt upon his Merits by this deviliſh Doctrine concerning the meritoriouſneſs of good works, whereby they gratifie the Devil (Chriſt's great Enemy) unto the ruine of their own Souls. And if it be deviliſh and wicked to aſſert the meritoriouſneſs of really good works,

2. It is much more deviliſh and wicked to aſſert works of Supererogation to be meritorious. Works of Supererogation, according to the Papiſts, are ſuch works which we have no precept for, but for which there are Evangelical Counſels, in order to the attainment of more than ordinary perfection; and by theſe works the Papiſts affirm that a man or woman may merit not only for themſelves, but alſo for others; and ſuch a work they aſſert this of the Celibate Vow and ſtate to be. The deviliſhneſs of this Aſſertion will appear in that,

1. There are no ſuch works as works of Supererogation: for thoſe works which the Papiſts ſo term, are either good or evil; if evil, they are beneath thoſe which are commanded; if they are good works, they are commanded, otherwiſe they could not be good works, their goodneſs ariſing from their conformity to the command. Whatever work tranſgreſſeth the command, is ſin; whatever work tranſgreſſeth not the command, is duty, and ſo cannot be a work of Supererogation. Unto which Argument I may add another, That if all men fall ſhort of their duty, they cannot do any work of Supererogation which is more than their duty: the former is ſo great a truth, that every truly humble Chriſtian will acknowledge; and therefore the latter will follow, that there can be no works of Supererogation, which none but a proud Papiſt will aſſert. What the Papiſts plead as to Evangelical Counſels, when they have proved them to be more or other than Evangelical Commands, ſome queſtion may be made of the firmneſs of my Argument; but this they will never do.

2. And

2. And if there be no ſuch works of Supererogation, be ſure there can be no merit in them, no not for themſelves that do them, and much leſs for others: the Scripture is clear againſt the meritoriouſneſs of all good works which are commanded, *Luk.* 17. 10. *So likewiſe ye, when ye have done all thoſe things which are commanded you, ſay, We are unprofitable ſervants, we have done that which was our duty to do.* And if thoſe works which are commanded be not meritorious, much leſs can thoſe works be meritorious which are not commanded: and if the beſt works cannot be profitable to our ſelves by way of merit, much leſs can they be profitable by way of merit unto others. I have ſometimes wondered that any of the Papiſts that are learned ſhould be ſo far befool'd and deluded by the Devil, as really to believe that there can be ſuch works of Supererogation, whereby men make God their Debtor for more than he doth or can pay to themſelves, and therefore that he is obliged to pay it unto others upon their account; the Aſſertion being ſo horribly impious and abſurd, ſo diſhonourable unto God, and ſo derogatory unto Jeſus Chriſt.

3. But thirdly, It is of all moſt deviliſh and wicked to aſſert the Celibate Vow and ſtate (which really is, eſpecially to ſome, a great ſin) to be meritorious of eternal life. I have already proved that it is a ſin for any to vow and live in a Celibate ſtate, who have not the gift; and yet the Papiſts, being taught by the Devil, do aſſert that this is meritorious. I grant indeed that it is meritorious of eternal Death and Damnation; but to ſay it is meritorious of eternal Life and Salvation, is as much as if they ſhould ſay that the wages of ſin is eternal life, which none but the Devil can put into the minds of any to imagine, when it is ſo contrary unto reaſon, and the expreſs words of the Apoſtle.

Arg. 4. That Doctrine which is a Badge or Character of Antichriſt, is a deviliſh wicked Doctrine: But the Popiſh Doctrine which forbiddeth the Marriage of the Clergy, and of all under the Celibate Vow, is a Badge or Character of Antichriſt: Therefore this Popiſh Doctrine is deviliſh and wicked.

The Badge and Character of Antichriſt is deviliſh and wicked, Antichriſt being called in the Scripture, *the wicked one, the man of ſin, the ſon of perdition*, 2 Theſſ. 2. 3, 8. He ſtileth himſelf Chriſt's Vicar, but he is Chriſt's great Antagoniſt; and though he be called *Holy Father*, by ſuch as are of the Romiſh Church, yet he is indeed the firſt-born ſon of the Devil: He is called in regard of his power *the Beaſt that aſcendeth out of the bottomleſs pit, and goeth into perdition*, Rev. 17. 8. and is deſcribed to be full of Names of Blaſphemy, Verſe 3. and *his coming* is ſaid to *be after Satan, with all power, and ſigns, and lying wonders, and with all deceiveableneſs of unrighteouſneſs*, 2 Theſſ. 2. 9, 10. Antichriſt then being inſpired and acted by the Devil, and ſo fraught with wickedneſs, that Doctrine which is a Badge and Character of him, muſt needs be deviliſh and wicked. Now that this Popiſh Doctrine which forbid-

deth the Marriage of the Clergy, and of all under the Celibate Vow, is the Badge and Character of Antichrist, is evident in the Text. As the Scripture doth foretel that Antichrist should arise in the latter times, so it doth give several Characters whereby Antichrist might be known when he should make his appearance in the World, that the true Church of Christ might be aware of him: And as there are several plain Characters of Antichrist together in 2 *Thess.* 2. from the 3. Verse to the 13. Verse; so the same Apostle doth give several Characters of the same Antichrist in the Text, all which are applicable unto the Roman Papacy, or Church of *Rome*, as I have shewn in the explication of the Text, amongst which Characters this is one, *That it forbiddeth to marry.* The Reply of Popish Writers unto this Text, is this, *That the Prohibition of Marriage here spoken of, is the Prohibition of all Marriage, whereas they do not forbid all Marriage; and that the Apostle hath here a respect unto the* Manichees, *who condemned Marriage it self.* For answer unto which, 1. There is no such thing in the Text as *Prohibition of all Marriage*; and it is certain that such who *forbid the Marriage* of some, do *forbid to marry.* 2. St. *Austin* telleth us, that the *Manichees* did not *forbid the Marriage* of all, they allowed the *Marriage* of them which they called *Auditors*, although not the *Marriage* of them which they called *Elect*; therefore by all that the Papists can say, they cannot stave off this *Character of Antichrist* from the Roman Papacy.

This shall suffice for the proof, that *the Popish Doctrine which forbiddeth to marry, is deviliſh and wicked.*

3. The third thing I am to do, is to answer the Popish Arguments which they bring to prove the unlawfulness of the *Marriage of the Clergy*, and such who are under the Celibate Vow.

Arg. 1. Their first Argument is drawn from the uncleanness which they affirm to be contracted by *Marriage*, such as the *Clergy*, and all who are more immediately devoted unto God, must abstain from: This they endeavour to prove, 1. By the Levitical uncleanness, which we read of *Lev.* 15. and the speech of *Abimelech* unto *David*, 1 *Sam.* 21. 4. 2. Such as are *married*, they say, are in the flesh, therefore unclean, and so cannot please God, *Rom.* 8. 8. 3. They argue that if such as would give themselves to prayer and fasting, must abstain for a while, 1 *Cor.* 7. 5. and that because of the uncleanness herein; then *Ministers* who give themselves wholly to the *Ministry of the Word and unto Prayer*, must abstain altogether, and therefore they ought not to *marry*, because of the uncleanness they will hereby contract, which is unbeseeming their sacred Function.

Answ. 1. There is no uncleanness or unholiness in *Marriage* it self, or in any use thereof, which is evident, because *Marriage* was instituted in *Paradise*, in the state of man's innocency; and *Marriage* being God's Ordinance, must needs be holy, because all God's Ordinances are so. Moreover, the Scripture calleth *Marriage* honourable in all, where the

Bed

Bed is undefiled by *Adultery*, *Heb.*13.4. and if *Marriage* be honourable in all, then it is holy, (for every ſin is diſhonourable) and therefore it is not unbeſeeming the moſt ſacred Function. When the Apoſtle doth exhort, 1 *Theſ.*4. 3, 4. *that every one ſhould know how to poſſeſs his veſſel in ſanctification and honour*, it is not by abſtaining from *Marriage*, but *by abſtaining from Fornication*. Adultery and Fornication indeed do both wound and ſtain the ſpirit, as well as pollute the body; but there is a real innocency, holineſs and chaſtity in *Marriage*, and the uſe of it according unto God's Ordinance.

2. The Papiſts will find it difficult to prove that there was ever any Levitical uncleanneſs by the uſe of *Marriage*, that Scripture in *Lev.* 15. ſpeaking of ſomething elſe, as will appear unto ſuch as read, and ſeriouſly weigh the place. What they urge from *Abimelech*'s ſpeech unto *David*, will appear not to be uncleanneſs by the lawful uſe of *Marriage*, for then it would have been unlawful for the *married Prieſts* continually to eat of the hallowed bread, which who will ſay they were not allowed to do? but *Abimelech*'s ſpeech was either concerning the unlawful uſe of women, or of their coming near their wives in the time of their ſeparation. But beſides this, and more which might be ſaid, did not modeſty forbid, if the Papiſts could prove Levitical uncleanneſs to have been herein, which they cannot do; yet what can thence be argued, the Levitical Law being now abrogated? can they ſay that which rendred the Jews in thoſe days legally unclean, doth now render Chriſtians morally unclean? May we not from hence argue for the *Marriage of Miniſters*, rather than find any ſhew of Argument againſt their *Marriage*? For if the *Prieſts*, notwithſtanding this Levitical uncleanneſs, which the Papiſts do here underſtand, did *marry* without ſin; how much more may *Miniſters* without ſin now *marry*, when all Levitical uncleanneſſes are at an end?

3. It is a groſs miſ-interpretation of *Rom.* 8. 8. to apply it unto *married perſons*, as if they were the perſons ſpoken of by the Apoſtle *that are in the fleſh*, and *cannot pleaſe God*. Who will or can upon Scripture-grounds ſay, that all *married Chriſtians*, though never ſo holy and unblameable in their Converſation, are in the fleſh? Can none pleaſe God that are *married*? Hence then it will follow, that no *married perſons* can be ſaved, becauſe none in the fleſh, none that do not pleaſe God, ſhall attain his Salvation. But ſurely the Papiſts will not damn all *married perſons*; however they may deal with ours, ſurely they will ſpare their own.

4. As to their inference from 1 *Cor.* 7. 5. becauſe ſuch as would give themſelves to faſting and prayer, muſt abſtain for a while, therefore Miniſters muſt abſtain from *Marriage* altogether, is ſuch a *non ſequitur*, as the Schools will hiſs at. 1. The Apoſtle maketh no ſuch inference all along the Chapter againſt the *Marriage of Miniſters*, but on the contrary preſcribeth *Marriage* as the duty of all who cannot contain. 2. There

is

is a great difference between the abstaining which the Apostle speaketh of, and the not *marrying* which the Papists plead for; although the Apostle exhorts *married persons* to separate themselves by consent for a time, that they might give themselves unto fasting and prayer, yet in the same Verse and breath he bids them to come soon together again, lest Satan should tempt them for their incontinency. And who can rationally infer hence the duty of *Ministers* to abstain from *Marriage?*

3. The fasting and prayer here spoken of, which calls for *married persons* abstaining, it is fasting and prayer upon some extraordinary occasion, either publick or private, when *the Bridegroom is to come forth of his Chamber, and the Bride out of her Closet,* as *Joel* 2. 17. and not of ordinary prayer and seeking of God: And unless *Ministers* were always to be engaged in solemn fasting and prayer, there is no shew of reason why from this place they should be obliged not to *marry.* And why may not the Papists as well argue, because *married persons* are to abstain from eating, that they may give themselves to fasting and prayer; therefore there is uncleanness and evil in eating; and that *Ministers* who are to give themselves unto the *Ministry* of the Word and prayer, ought to abstain from eating altogether? for this will follow as well as the other.

Arg. 2. The second Popish Argument is drawn from 1 *Cor.* 7. 1. *It is good for a man not to touch a woman.* And Vers. 8. *I say therefore unto the unmarried and widows, It is good for them if they abide even as I.* If it be good for the unmarried and widows to abide in a single estate like unto the Apostle, then say they, it is evil for such to *marry*; and therefore the Clergy should abstain from this evil.

Answ. 1. If it were an evil of sin for the unmarried and widows to *marry*, then it would not only be unlawful for the *Clergy*, and all under the Celibate Vow to *marry*, but it would be unlawful for any *Christians* whatsoever to *marry*, because all ought to abhor, refrain, and flee from that which is an evil of sin: And where is the concernment of *Ministers* more than others in this Scripture?

2. That may be good for some, which is evil for others: a single estate may be good and best for such as have the gift of continency, and are perswaded in their heart that in this estate they may most glorifie God; whereas this estate may be evil for such as are without this gift, or in likelihood may most glorifie God in a married estate.

3. It may be good at some time not to *marry*, namely, in the time of the Churches persecution; and all that have the gift at such a time, should chuse the Celibate estate, that they might be the more ready both to do and suffer for Christ, and be the more free from temptations to Apostacy: and the most that can be said of the good here spoken of, is, that it is the good of conveniency, not the good of absolute duty; unto which is opposed the evil of inconveniency, not the evil of sin. Indeed it is an evil of inconveniency, and an aggravation of calamity to

be

be married in times of perſecution, for *ſuch*, ſaith the Apoſtle, Verſ. 28. of this Chapter, *ſhall have trouble*, that is, greater trouble than others, *in the fleſh:* but it is the duty of all to make choice rather of this evil of greater trouble and inconveniency, than to expoſe themſelves unto the evil of ſin by uncleanneſs and incontinency.

4. The Apoſtle is ſo far from aſſerting it to be an evil of ſin for any in the worſt of times to *marry*, that he aſſerteth the quite contrary when there is a neceſſity for it, Verſ. 36. *If need ſo require, let him do what he will, he ſinneth not, let them marry.* And Verſ. 38. *So then he that giveth her in marriage doth well.* It is plain then by all to be ſeen, that the Popiſh Argument from this place is frivolous, and that it carrieth no ſhadow of good conſequence in it againſt the *Marriage* of the Clergy.

Arg. 3. The third Popiſh Argument is drawn from 1 *Cor.* 7. 32, 33, 34. *But I would have you without carefulneſs: He that is unmarried careth for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may pleaſe the Lord: But he that is married careth for the things that are of the world, how he may pleaſe his wife. There is a difference alſo between a wife and a virgin: The unmarried woman careth for the things of the Lord, how ſhe may be holy in body and ſpirit; but ſhe that is married careth for the things of the world, how ſhe may pleaſe her husband.* The Argument from hence in reference unto Miniſters is this: Miniſters above all others are warned to take heed of entangling themſelves with the affairs and cares of this life, 2 *Tim.* 2. 4. and being devoted unto the Lord more immediately by the Office of their Miniſtry, they ought always to care for the things which belong to the Lord, how they may pleaſe the Lord. And becauſe *Marriage* doth engage in the former, and taketh off from the latter, as this Text doth intimate, therefore they ought to refrain *Marriage.*

Anſw. 1. It is not univerſally true, that all who are *unmarried do care for the things which belong to the Lord, how they may pleaſe the Lord*, and that hereby they are taken off from minding and caring for the things of the world. As to the latter, who intermeddle more with ſecular affairs than many of the Popiſh unmarried Clergy? Why do any of them exerciſe Temporal Juriſdiction, if their Celibate ſtate be in order to free them from worldly cares and buſineſs? As to the former, if ſo be that Adultery, Fornication, Murder, Sodomitical uncleanneſs, and other vile practices be pleaſing to the Lord, there are and have been many Popes and Popiſh Biſhops, many Prieſts, Jeſuites, Fryars, and other unmarried perſons under the Celibate Vow among the Papiſts, that with great induſtry have *cared for the things which belong unto the Lord, how they may pleaſe the Lord*, as I ſhall make evident in the Uſe: But hereby they will be found to have taken care not only of the things of the world, but of the things of the fleſh, how they may pleaſe the fleſh, and the things of the Devil, how they may pleaſe the Devil, whoſe ſervants and children they are.

2. Neither,

2. Neither, secondly, is it universally true, that such as *are married do care for the things of the world*, chiefly, so as to neglect the things of God, as instance may be given in the holiness of many *married persons*, which the Scripture doth take notice of. It is said, *Gen.* 5. 22. That *Enoch walked with God, after he begat Methusalah, three hundred years, and begat sons and daughters. Abraham*, who is called the *Friend of God*; *Moses*, unto whom the *Lord spake face to face*; *Samuel*, who was so highly *in favour with God*; *David*, who was *a man after God's own heart*; *Isaiah*, *Ezekiel*, and almost all the Prophets, were *married persons:* and we hardly read of any in the Old Testament that were famous for integrity and zeal for God, but they were such as were *married.* I have also given instance already in the New Testament-times of *married* Apostles, and did not they care for the things that belonged to the Lord, how they might please the Lord? And how many Ministers are there now in the Conjugal state, as eminent as any others whatsoever for their holy and strict lives? Will not many of them say, that their Wives have been so far from engaging and entangling them in worldly cares, that on the contrary they have proved real helpers of them, and have taken off in a great measure the burthen of those worldly cares, which lay more heavy upon them in their single estate?

3. It is granted that *Marriage* is often-times an occasion of more worldly care than a single estate; and that single persons, who really are endowed with the gift of continency, have ordinarily the advantage of most freedom from perplexing trouble, and thoughtfulness about the World, and for attending upon the Lord with the least distraction; yet such single persons as are without the gift are exposed unto more distraction, and that which is worse, unto so much sin, such burnings of lustful desires, that they cannot attend upon the Lord acceptably, without the use of the remedy which God hath provided against incontinency.

4. Men may care for the things that belong unto the world moderately, and labour to please their wives in the Lord subordinately, and not transgress the bounds of their duty, yea to neglect this would be their sin; and yet at the same time they may care for the things that belong to the Lord, how they may please the Lord chiefly: for if the one had been inconsistent with the other, the Apostle would have forbidden *Marriage* absolutely, it being the absolute indispensable duty of all, and necessary unto Salvation, that they labour chiefly to please the Lord: but the Apostle professeth the contrary, that *concerning Virgins he had no command from the Lord*, Vers. 25. that is, to forbid them from the Lord to marry; but in case of necessity he lets them know that *Marriage* was their duty. Yet because both men and women are more prone to exceed the bounds as to worldly cares and distraction in God's service when married, especially when full of Children, and little in the world to provide for them, or in a time of persecution, then in the single

ſingle eſtate, endowed with the gift; therefore he doth expreſs himſelf thus as we read in the Scripture urged. But none can infer hence, that it is the will of the Lord that Miniſters ſhould not marry, who though they be devoted to the ſervice of God more immediately, and ought always to care for the things that belong to the Lord, above all others to pleaſe him, may do this in a married eſtate, as hath been ſhewn; and if there be any Argument in it againſt Marriage, it is an Argument againſt the Marriage of all Chriſtians, rather than againſt the Marriage particularly of Miniſters, the perſons the Apoſtle writing unto, and unto whom he gives the advice in this Chapter, being not Miniſters, but ordinary Chriſtians amongſt the *Corinthians*. The uttermoſt that can be argued from this place in reference unto Miniſters, is, that ſuch of them as are unmarried, and have the gift of continency in the time of the Churches perſecution, or in ſuch circumſtances of their condition in the World, that by Marriage they are likely to be plunged and incumbered with more worldly cares and diſtraction, and to be leſs ſerviceable unto the Lord in a married eſtate, than they are in the ſingle; that in ſuch a caſe they ought to continue ſingle, ſo long as God doth continue the gift unto them: but this is no Argument for the Popiſh forbidding the Marriage of the whole Clergy.

Arg. 4. The fourth Popiſh Argument is drawn from 1 *Tim.* 5. 11, 12. *But the younger widows refuſe, for when they have begun to wax wanton againſt Chriſt, they will marry, having damnation, becauſe they have caſt off their firſt faith.* Now the interpretation of, and the arguings of the Papiſts from this Scripture, may run thus: 1. That there was a ſociety of Widows maintained by the Church, more immediately devoted unto God, who were to continue in ſupplications and prayers night and day, as Verſ. 5. and that theſe Widows were under a vow to continue in their ſingle eſtate unto their lives end, that they might be the more fit for their employment; and this vow was their firſt faith, ſpoken of Verſ. 12. becauſe they entered into this vow when they were firſt admitted into this ſociety. 2. That ſuch Widows as after this vow did marry, they waxed wanton hereby from Chriſt, and had damnation upon the account of their caſting off this their firſt faith, or breaking their Celibate Vow. 3. That if Widows, then Virgins too might be gathered into ſocieties to ſequeſter themſelves from all worldly affairs, for the more immediate ſervice of God, and enter into the ſame Celibate Vow. 4. That the Clergy of all ranks being by their Office devoted more immediately unto God, they ought to enter into the Celibate Vow, which they impoſe upon all in their admiſſion into ſacred Functions. 5. That all who have made this Celibate Vow, if afterward they attempt to marry, they incur the penalty not only of deprivation from men, but alſo of eternal damnation from God.

Anſw. 1. We grant that there was in the Primitive times a number of Widows devoted more immediately unto the ſervice of God, whom

the Church did maintain, and who were to be qualified according to what the Apostle doth mention, Vers. 9, 10.

2. It is as easie for us to deny, as for them to affirm, that these Widows did enter into a Celibate Vow upon their first admission into this number, this Scripture making no mention of any such Vow, and therefore they can never prove it.

3. By the first faith here spoken of, it is more rational to understand it not of any Celibate Vow, but of their Vow in Baptism, (which is the first faith of Christians) whereby they were devoted unto the fear and service of the Lord all their days; and this, by their wantonness from Christ, or lascivious practices, and turning aside after Satan, spoken of Vers. 15. they did cast off, and for this they had damnation.

4. We deny that the sin of these Widows lay in their marrying, but in their wantonness and breach of faith with Christ, otherwise the Apostle would not have given direction that these younger women (although received into this number) should marry, bear Children, guide the House, and give no occasion (through wantonness) to the Adversary to speak reproachfully, as he doth Vers. 14. That the Apostle speaketh of younger women of the number, it is evident, because he saith that some of them had waxen wanton from Christ, had cast off their first faith, had turned aside after Satan; and therefore he doth direct concerning the rest of the younger women, to prevent these evils, that they should marry; and surely he would not have directed them to this, had it been a sin, and had their Marriage it self been a casting off of their first faith.

5. If we should suppose (although we do not grant) that by the first faith is meant a Celibate Vow; yet it doth not follow from hence, that either Virgins or younger Widows have leave from God to enter into such a Vow: for the Apostle doth straightly charge that no Widow for the future should be admitted into this number under threescore years old, at which years there is no such danger of their falling into wanton practices, Vers. 9. and younger Widows he would have refused, Vers. 11. And what plea then can there be from hence for the society of Nuns, and their Celibate Vows, when most of them are young at their first admission?

6. And if there can be from this place no good plea for younger women to enter into Celibate Vows, much less can there be any hence for the Celibate Vows of the Clergy.

7. Therefore it is sinful for any, especially younger men or women, to make Celibate Vows, when such Vows may not be in their own power to keep; and such who have rashly made them, it is a greater sin for them to keep, when they have not the gift of continency, than to break them by holy Wedlock, which they may do without the penalty of eternal damnation.

Arg. 5. The fifth and laſt Popiſh Argument is drawn from Authority. *Bellarmine*, after ſufficient weakneſs betrayed in his *Scripture-Proofs*, doth annex, 1. The Teſtimony of divers Councils, *Eaſtern*, *African*, *Italian*, *French*, *Spaniſh* and *German*. 2. The Teſtimony of divers Popes or Biſhops of *Rome*. 3. The Teſtimony of divers Fathers, both *Greek* and *Latine*. Should I repeat all which he maketh theſe to ſpeak, I ſhould weary both my ſelf and the Reader; and how infirm his Argumentation is from hence, will appear in the Anſwer.

Anſw. 1. It is well known by thoſe that are vers'd in Councils, and have written on this ſubject, that the Councils of *Ancyra*, *Nice*, *Gangra* and *Trull*, (the moſt ancient which *Bellarmine* and other Papiſts do cite) do not really favour this Popiſh Doctrine. One Canon of the Council of *Ancyra* hath this paſſage in it, Διάκονοι ὅσοι καθίστανται, &c. *All Deacons that are eſtabliſhed in their Charges, if they have declared that they have need to marry, and cannot remain as they are, let them remain in their ſervice after they are married:* and let any judge whether this could be conſiſtent with a general Prohibition of the Marriage of the Clergy. The Council of *Nice* indeed did decree, *That no Biſhop, Preſbyter or Deacon, ſhould have any women in their houſes except Mother, Siſter, or Aunt*; therefore they were prohibited, ſaith *Bellarmine*, the having Wives, and ſo ought not to marry: whereas it is evident unto all that are unbyaſſed by prejudice, and make an impartial ſearch into the Records of that Council, that this Prohibition did not ſhut out the Wives, but unmarried Aſſociates, from the Houſes of Eccleſiaſticks that were ſingle, for the prevention of ſcandal by Fornication, which ſingle perſons living together, eſpecially in their youth and privacy, might be tempted unto.

Let us ſee what *Socrates* in his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory doth relate concerning the Tranſactions of this Council about this point; which we ſhall find to this purpoſe: *Some would have brought in a new Law, to forbid the Clergy to cohabit with their Wives; but* Paphnutius *a Confeſſor, and although unmarried himſelf, ſtood up and vehemently cryed out, That Marriage was honourable, congreſs with the Wife chaſte, and therefore did counſel them not to lay ſuch a heavy yoke upon perſons in holy Orders which they could not bear, and hereby give occaſion both to them and their Wives to live incontinently: upon which ſpeech of* Paphnutius *the Council did both approve, and praiſe his ſentence, made no ſuch Law, but left it to every mans liberty to do what he would in that point.* Socr. Lib. 1. Cap. 11. Sozom. Lib. 1. Cap. 23. Here we ſee that this Law (now eſtabliſhed amongſt the Papiſts) is called *a new Law*, it was never Enacted before, and it was only a Law which ſome would have brought in, and therefore was not Enacted then: it was called *a heavy yoke*, and not being found by that Council to be Chriſt's yoke, it was laid aſide. The Council of *Gangra*, (all whoſe Canons the Council of *Trull* doth approve of) hath this Canon: Εἴ τις διακρίνοιτο, &c. *If any make a difference*

of a married Priest, as if none ought to partake of the Oblation when he doth the service, let him be Anathema. I might give other instances of passages in other Councils, which *Bellarmine* doth make mention of, to shew how he doth corrupt many of their sayings, in favour of this Doctrine; but I refer the learned Reader unto *Chamier*'s answer, and to *Junius*'s Animadversions upon *Bellarmine*'s Controversies. It is most certain, (if History may be believed) that the most ancient and most authentick Councils, according to their most authentick Copies, did never (like the Papists) forbid the Marriage of the Clergy, whatever some of them may seem to do in the corrupt Translations of them, and false Glosses upon them by the Papists: the Canons of some particular Councils, or rather Popish Synods of latter date, are of no great signification in the proof of this point.

2. The Testimonies which *Bellarmine* bringeth of Popes, or the Bishops of *Rome*, carry no weight: It is acknowledged by the most, that Pope *Syricius* first did forbid the Marriage of the Clergy, but what he did was very unjust: hear what *Junius* doth say of it: *Syricius contra Verbum Dei & Jus naturale ipsum voluit istud cœlibatus jugum Ecclesiasticis imponere, & juris ignorantia, & superstitiosa cacozelia.* Syricius *against the Word of God, and the Law of Nature it self, would needs lay the Celibate Law upon Ecclesiasticks through ignorance and superstitious Zeal.* I shall readily grant, That the Bishops of *Rome*, especially of latter years since the Apostacy of that Church unto Heresie, Antichristianism and Idolatry, have been generally against the Marriage of the Clergy: but wherefore hath this been? Not out of true Zeal for Chastity, and the purity of all in sacred Orders, as is pretended; but out of carnal Policy, for the enriching of their Church hereby, and the preserving of its Revenues, which might be too profusely expended and alienated in the providing for Wife and Children.

3. The Testimonies which are brought out of ancient Fathers for the most part are either corrupted, or they do not militate against the Marriage, but against the incontinency of the Clergy; and the purity which the Fathers speak of, as requisite in persons of that Function, is as well consistent with a married, as with a single estate, and more ordinarily to be found in the former, than in the latter. But if some of the Fathers were against the Marriage of Ecclesiasticks, this doth not prove the unlawfulness of such Marriages, unless it could be proved to be so by the Word of God; and this the Papists can never prove unto such who do look into the Scriptures with an unprejudiced mind, when they are so plain and clear for the universal lawfulness of Marriage without any particular exceptions.

Use 1. Here you may see the deviliſh wickedness of the Church of *Rome*; it would both spend too much time, and carry me besides my purpose too far, to set forth the wickedness of this Apostate Church in the full latitude thereof; I shall only speak of the wickedness which this Doctrine

Doctrine that forbiddeth to marry, is the occaſion of. There are three woful effects which this wicked deviliſh Doctrine hath produced: 1. Wicked Indulgencies of their Popes: 2. Wicked Principles of their Jeſuites: 3. Wicked Practices both of their Popes and others under the Celibate Vow.

1. The Popes or Biſhops of *Rome*, however ſevere againſt the Marriage of their Clergy, yet they have given Indulgencies for Whoredom, Sodomy, and ſuch like moſt foul abominations. Hear the complaints as well as acknowledgments of *Eſpencæus*, a Writer of their own, *Lib. 2. Cap. 7. De Continentia*; his words are theſe: *Pro puro mundoque cœlibatu ſucceſſit impurus & immundus concubinatus, ut quod eleganter de perſecutione, cap. 29. Conquerebatur D. Bernardus, latere, nec præ multitudine queat, nec præ impudentia quærat: hæc inquam tolerantia altius radices egit, permiſſis alicubi ſub annuo cenſu clericis atque laicis cum ſuis concubinis cohabitare: Quod utinam falſo & imerito extaret inter Gravamina Germaniæ; adeoque etiam continentibus ad omnem cenſum perſolvendum coactis, quo ſoluto iis liceret, vel continentibus vel incontinentibus eſſe. O rem execrandam! In ſtead of the pure and clean Celibate, there hath ſucceeded an impure and unclean Concubinate, which, as* Bernard *elegantly complaineth in his 29 Chapter concerning Perſecution, neither can be concealed, it is ſo frequent, neither doth ſeek to be concealed, it is ſo impudent: this Toleration or Indulgence hath got firm footing, both the Clergy as well as Laity having permiſſion given unto them to cohabit with their Concubines, upon the payment of a yearly ſum of money. And I wiſh that theſe things were falſly and undeſervedly extant amongſt the Grievances of* Germany, *who complain that even ſuch as are continent are forced to pay the annual Rent; which being paid, they are at their own choice whether they will contain or not, whether they will have a Concubine, otherwiſe called a Whore, or not. O execrable wickedneſs!* And the ſame Author in his Comment upon *Titus*, doth further acknowledge in theſe words: *Epiſcopi, Archidiaconi & Officiales plerunque dum Diœceſes & Parœcias obequitant, non tam facinoroſos & criminum reos pœnis & correctionibus a vitiis deterrent, quam pecunia emungunt & exugunt tum Clericos, tum laicos; & hos cum concubinis, pellicibus & meretriculis cohabitare, liberoſque procreare ſinunt, accepto ab iis certo quotannis cenſu atque adeo alicubi accipiunt a continentibus; habeat (aiunt) ſi velit, & quoties enim quiſque talis, (cum tales tamen tam multi ſunt) hodie aliter punitur? Biſhops, Archdeacons and Officials, do ride about their Dioceſſes and Pariſhes for the moſt part, not to deter the wicked by corrections and puniſhments from their vice, but to draw out and defraud both Clergy and Laity of their Money, whom upon the payment of a yearly Revenue, they permit to cohabit with Concubines and Whores, and to procreate Children. And this Revenue they receive in ſome places of the Continent, for he may have a Concubine or Whore (ſay they) if he pleaſe. And how often are ſuch Prieſts as keep Whores (although ſo many) puniſhed*

other-

otherwise? There is a Book lately published by *Anthony Egans*, B. D. late Confessor-General of the Kingdom of *Ireland*, and now Minister of the Gospel according to the Reformed Religion. The Title of it is this, *The Book of Rates now used in the Sin-Custom-House of the Church and Court of* Rome, *containing the Bulls, Dispensations and Pardons for all manner of villanies and wickedness, with the several sums of Moneys given and to be paid for them.* Page 13. there are these Dispensations for Priests and others under the Celibate Vow: *A Priest or Fryar having lain, or carnally sinned with a Woman of whatsoever sort or degree, whether a Nun, or Kinswoman, or a Relation, or with any other whether married or single, whether within the Bounds or Cloisters of his Monastery, or elsewhere, whether the Absolution be made in the Name of the Clergy or no, it gives him power to exercise his Function, and to hold his Livings, and that together with the Inhibitory Clause, he paying* 36 l. 9 s. and 6 d. *And if besides this there be an Absolution for Buggery, or for unnatural sin committed with bruit Beasts, a Dispensation, together with the Inhibitory Clause, will come to* 90 l. 12 s. 1 d. *A simple Absolution for the sin of Buggery, or the sin contrary to Nature, that is to say, with bruit Beasts, together with a Dispensation, and the Inhibitory Clause, is* 36 l. 9 s. *A Nun having played the Whore very often, aut intra aut extra septa Monasterii, within or without the bounds of the Monastery, is to be absolved and rehabilited to hold the Dignity of her Order for* 36 l. 9 s. *An Absolution for one that keeps a Whore at Bed and Board, with a Dispensation to hold a Benefice, is* 4 l. 5 s. 6 d. *Prideaux* telleth us of Pope *Sixtus* the fourth, *That he made a grant unto the Cardinal of* Lucia *to use unnatural lusts for three months in the year, namely,* June, July, *and* August: but whether the Cardinal had the Dispensation *gratis*, or paid a sum of money for it, the Author doth not relate. This is that Pope who built a Stews at *Rome* of his own cost, and well might he do it, when the Popes do receive such Revenues from such base Houses. See *Cornelius Agrippa de Vanitate Scientiarum, Cap.* 64. Lycurgus *and* Solon (saith he) *those Heathen Law-givers, erected publick Stews, but that is no marvel, for of late years Pope* Sixtus *the fourth builded a goodly Stews in* Rome. *The* Corinthians, Cyprians, *and* Babylonians, *did encrease their Revenue by the gain of Stews, which in* Italy *also at this day is no unusual matter; for Whores of* Rome *do pay weekly to the Pope a* Julio, *the whole Revenue whereof in the year doth often exceed twenty thousand Duckets.* Hence it is that one of their Poets doth complain,

Roma ipsa Lupanar
Reddita; nunc facta est toto execrabilis orbe.

"That *Rome* was become a Brothel-House, and grown execrable "throughout the whole World.

The

The Pope indeed will not allow of Marriage in his Clergy, but by his Indulgencies he doth make proviſion for their fleſh, that they may fulfil their luſts by Fornications and all manner of uncleanneſſes, which may bring in filthy lucre into his Coffers. Thus concerning the wicked Indulgencies of the Pope.

2. The wicked Principles of the Jeſuites is another effect of this Popiſh Doctrine which forbiddeth to marry. The Jeſuitical Doctors pretend to more Sanctity, Learning and Subtilty than others; let us ſee what ſome of their Principles be, and Poſitions in their ſtating of Caſes of Conſcience concerning uncleanneſſes. I ſhall refer the Reader only unto a Book called, *The Myſtery of Jeſuitiſm*, ſee Vol. 1. p. 147. Father *Bauny* hath this Aſſertion as it is cited out of his Theolog. Mor. trac. 4. de pœnit. p. 94. *It is lawful for perſons of all qualities and conditions to go into the places of common proſtitution, there to convert ſinful women, although it be very probable that they will commit the ſin there themſelves; nay haply though they have found by frequent experience that they are drawn into ſin by the ſight and inſinuations of thoſe women.* Who ſeeth not that this Aſſertion doth give encouragement unto the unmarried Popiſh Clergy to run upon occaſions, and manifeſt temptations unto the ſin of filthy Fornication? For who are more fit, may they think, to convert thoſe ſinful women, than Eccleſiaſtical perſons? But for ſuch to go into places of common proſtitution to do it, is both ſcandalous for any, eſpecially for Miniſters, and dangerous leſt themſelves be entangled and defiled hereby. But the Jeſuite telleth us, they may venture into ſuch places; although it be probable they will, and though they have been often drawn into that foul ſin hereby; and what is it that they can plead for the lawfulneſs of ſuch practice? it is only this, their directing their intention to convert ſinful women; and may they run into their embraces that they may convert them? may they venture upon a probability of being drawn by them unto this ſin, that without any probability of ſucceſs they may draw them from it? and when they have been often enticed and overcome, may they put their foot again into the ſnare? are ſuch like to perſwade others to repentance and chaſtity, who have been often unclean in ſuch places themſelves? But let us ſee further what other of their Doctors ſay: In the *Additionale*, pag. 96. *Eſcobar* doth aſſert, *That a man who hath the reputation of being extreamly given to women, doth not commit any mortal ſin in ſollicieting a woman to condeſcend unto his deſires, when he doth not intend to put his deſign in execution.* This Doctor goeth a ſtep further, the former giveth allowance to go into places of common proſtitution, ſo that the intention be the converſion of ſinful women; and this telleth us that it is no mortal ſin to ſollicite women to be naught, if a man can but hold off his intention from the thing: but who is there that is extreamly addicted to women, and doth ſollicite, though he doth not actually intend the thing, till he knows the mind of the party, but if there be a compliance,

compliance, that will forbear and withdraw himself, as *Joseph* from his Mistress? May lecherous Mass-Priests sollicite women to lewdness without mortal sin? Who can deny this to be deviliſh wicked Doctrine? But although the Jesuites Principles do lead their Clergy to Fornication and Adultery, yet they would have them cautious that such impure facts of theirs may not be known, *si non caste, tamen caute.* If they do not live chastly, they would have them sin warily; and therefore they allow most horrid wickedness for the concealing such shame. P. 19. *Caramuel* asserteth in his *Fund. Theolog. Fund.* 55. *Sect.* 7. *That it is doubtful whether a religious man having made use of a woman, may not kill her, if she offer to discover what passed between them.* This Doctor doth make a doubt whether it be not lawful for their Priests to commit Murder that they may conceal their Adultery. But what if the woman the Priest is naught withal, be a wife, and she reveal nothing, but her husband cometh unawares upon them, and discovereth the fact? see what *Escobar* saith in such a case, cited pag. 94. out of his Tract. Theol. Tract. 4. Exam. 6. Cap. 5. *An Ecclesiastick surprized in Adultery, if he kill the womans husband whom he hath abused in his own defence, is not for that irregular.* Here the Doctor doth favour not only the murder of the wife if she reveal, but also the murder of the husband if he resist; and although the Marriage of Ecclesiasticks doth make them irregular, yet their Adulteries and Murders do not so, but they may according to these Principles continue in their Function, notwithstanding such horrid abominations. You see what provisions the Jesuites make for themselves and others of the Romish Clergy, for their encouragement, reputation and safety in their practice of the sin of Adultery: but do they take no care for the poor forlorn Nuns, who are mewed up in Cloisters, and are under the same Celibate Vow with themselves? The great danger is, when the Priests and Jesuites come amongst them, of their proving with child, and so of their discovering their own shame: is there no provision in this case? Yes, these kind Fathers have a Principle which may be of use to such, to encourage them with a *non obstante* to this danger unto lewd embraces. See Addit. p. 19. Egidius Trullench. in Decal. Tom. 5. Lib. 5. Cap. 1. asserteth, *That it is lawful to procure abortion before the child be quick in the womb, to save a Maids life or reputation.* I shall add but one Position more concerning the liberty which the Jesuites give unto the most impure persons to communicate immediately upon their confession, pag. 88. *Mascarennas Tract.* 4. *de Sacr. Eucharist. Disp.* 5. *Cap.* 7. doth assert, *That either a secular person, or a Priest being fallen into any kind of impurity whatsoever, nay though such as are against Nature, may, without so much as the least venial sin, (nay, are to be commended for it if they do) communicate the very same day after they have made confession thereof. That the Confessor ought to advise his Penitent to receive the Eucharist the very same day that he is fallen into such crimes, and that the Vow or Reso-*

lution

lution any one might have made not to come to the Lord's Table in that condition, were null. Thus if the Jeſuites acknowledge that a wound and defilement is contracted by ſome groſſer impieties and impurities; yet they can, according to their principles, quickly lick themſelves whole by their Confeſſions, and waſh themſelves clean by their Communicating; and what is this but an abominable profaning and polluting of the holy Sacrament, and an opening a wide door to all manner of licentiouſneſs? The Harlot could ſay unto the young man, *Prov.* 7. 12. *This day I have payed my vows*, and ſo ſhe was fitted for her wickedneſs. And if unmarried Eccleſiaſticks by Confeſſion and Communicating can ſo eaſily wipe off their guilt and filth, what encouragement muſt this needs give them to return preſently again with the Dog to his vomit, and with the Sow that is waſh'd to her wallowing in the mire? That the Jeſuites are not belyed by the Author of the Myſtery of Jeſuitiſm, in theſe and other groſs Principles and Aſſertions which they hold, may eaſily be known by ſuch as will conſult their Books in print, out of which they are extracted: I confeſs I have not conſulted all of them, not having them by me; but having peruſed his Citations of *Eſcobar*, whom I have, and finding him faithful there, I doubt not but he is faithful in the reſt.

3. The wicked practices both of Popes and others under the Celibate Vow, is another woful effect of this Popiſh Doctrine which forbiddeth to marry. And here I may well premiſe, that many thouſand lewdneſſes and foul abominations are and have been committed by Popiſh Votaries ſo ſecretly, that they never ſaw the light, neither have come abroad unto the notice of the world, theſe works being works of darkneſs which fly the light, and ſhrowd themſelves as cloſe as may be in dark corners, thoſe who are guilty endeavouring all they can to conceal their filthineſs; which however at the laſt day of revelation both of mens ſins and God's Judgments, will be made known and expoſed to the view both of men and Angels, *when the Lord will bring to light the hidden works of darkneſs, and make manifeſt all the counſels of the heart*, 1 *Cor.* 4. 5. Yet the wickedneſs of ſome Popes and their Clergy in this kind, hath been ſo notorious, that their own Hiſtorians have not thought fit to be altogether ſilent herein; and, as was ſaid before, their lewdneſs could not be concealed, it was ſo frequent; neither in many did it ſeek to be concealed, it was ſo impudent. It would ſpend more time than we have to be together, yea, although we ſhould ſtay here on this long Summers day till dark night, to enumerate the inſtances that might be given of the uncleanneſſes of Eccleſiaſticks in the Church of *Rome*. I ſhall mention only a few of the moſt remarkable amongſt many other, and begin with the viciouſneſs and filthineſs of the Popes, whoſe Title of Holineſs, and ſeverity againſt Matrimony, and impoſing the Celibate Vow upon others, one would think ſhould oblige themſelves unto more than ordinary mortification of fleſhly luſts, and exemplary chaſtity: but

we shall find by search into the History of the Popes lives, that they have generally been exceeding faulty as to women, and all sorts of filthy lusts. *Platina* doth complain that Riches had made the Church wanton, and Vice had no restraint. Pope *Sergius* the Third had his Sweet-heart *Marozia*, that famous Strumpet, who was the Mistress of his affections, and had no small Government in the Church, of whom in wicked Adultery, as *Luitprandus* doth record, he begat *John* the Eleventh, who afterward by his Mothers means got the Popedom. *Baronius* doth acknowledge that in those days the power of Harlots did so far prevail, that they both removed Popes rightly appointed, and also thrust in violent and wicked men into their room at their pleasure. By this *Marozia*'s means also it was that *Octavianus* (Son to *Albericus*) obtained the Popedom, called *John* the Twelfth, who, as *Baronius* doth relate, amongst other wickednesses, was accused in a Synod for abusing the Widow of *Rainerius*, for his filthiness with *Stephana* his Fathers Concubine, with *Anna* a Widow and her Neice. This is that Pope who castrated divers of his Cardinals because they favoured *Otho* the great; but if himself had been so served before he was made Pope, possibly he might have been more chaste: and yet whatever liberty this Pope took himself to commit Fornication and Adultery, he would not give liberty for Marriage to his Clergy, which God doth allow, for he sends over an Inhibition against Priests Marriage into *England*, which at that time caused no small stir: At length the hand of God was remarkable in the cutting off this Pope; for being taken one night in Adultery with another mans wife, he received such a wound in his Temples, that within the space of eight days after he died of it. Pope *Gregory* the Seventh (saith *Prideaux*) had his Minion *Matilda*, who left her own Husband to live with this holy Father. This is that *Gregory* who caused the Emperour *Henry* the Fourth, with his Empress, and Son, to come bare-footed in the cold Winter to his Castle at *Canneicum*, and there to wait three days fasting before he could have audience, which at length was obtained by the Mediation of Madam *Matilda*. *Platina* doth relate that in Pope *Honorius* the Second's time, one *Arnulphus* was put to death at *Rome* for his bitter invieghing against the pomp, luxury and lasciviousness of the Clergy, before whom he propounded the poverty of Christ, and his integrity of life for their imitation. It was from this Pope that *John Cremensis* was sent over Legat into *England*, to dissolve the Priests Marriages, but in the great heat of his urging his Commission, he was found in bed with a Whore. Good man! he would have all to live chastly without Wives and Matrimony, and he came over from *Rome* to shew them an example. Pope *Martin* the Fourth kept the Concubine of his Predecessor *Nicolas*, and removed all Bears from his Palace, lest the beholding of them should cause his Sweet-heart to bring forth a Bear; so fearful was he, that his bruitish lust would produce a bruitish off-spring. Pope *Benedict* the Twelfth is recorded to have bought

bought a beautiful young Woman of her Brother with a great ſum of money, that he might make uſe of her. Pope *Sixtus* the Fourth before-mentioned, who built the Stews at *Rome*, and allowed unnatural luſts to the Cardinal, would not wholly deny himſelf, eſpecially in thoſe luſts which are more natural, for he had his Concubine *Tyreſia*, for whom he provided Shooes covered with Pearls. Pope *Innocent* the Eighth had many baſe Children, gave a great Dowry with his Daughter *Theodorina*: *Mantuan* hath theſe Verſes on him:

Octo Nocens pueros genuit, totidemque puellas,
Hunc merito poteris dicere Roma patrem.

The ſignification of which is, that this Nocent (not Innocent) perſon, had begotten eight Boys, and as many Girls, and therefore deſerved the name of a Father; but I ſuppoſe none, except the Papiſts, will ſay that he was a holy Father. Pope *Alexander* the Sixth did ſucceed him in the Papacy, and his Hiſtory doth record that he exceeded him in lewdneſs and Adultery; on whoſe Daughter there are theſe Verſes:

Hic jacet in tumulo Lucretia nomine, ſed re
Thais, Alexandri Filia, Sponſa, Nurus.

Lucrece *by name here lies, but* Thais *in life,*
Pope Alexand*'s Child, Spouſe, and Sons Wife.*

This Pope had two Baſtards, a Son, and this Daughter *Lucretia*, whom he married unto this Son, and afterwards abuſed her himſelf; and it is ſtoried of him, that to compleat his other wickedneſſes, he gave himſelf unto the Devil. Pope *Julius* the Second was not much better, who abuſed two ingenuous Youths ſent by the Queen of *France* to be bred in *Italy*. Pope *Clement* the Seventh was ſo infamous, that becauſe of his own lewdneſs, and that of his Court, this Diſtick was written:

Roma vale, vidi, ſatis eſt vidiſſe, revertar
Cum Leno, aut Meretrix, Scurra, Cinædus ero.

Vile Rome *adieu, I did thee view, but hence no more will ſee,*
Till Pimp or Punck, or Jade or Spade, I do reſolve to be.

Paul the Third proſtituted his Siſter *Julia Farneſia* to *Alexander* the Sixth, that he might be made Cardinal; committed Inceſt with his own Daughter *Conſtantia*, poiſoned her Husband that he might enjoy her the more freely; was naught with his own Siſter, and taken in the Act by her Husband; and beſides his Inceſt, he is recorded to have been a Necromancer, and from this Pope's piety came the Council of *Trent*.

Pope *Julius* the Third was not inferiour unto him, who gave his Cardinals Hat unto a Sodomitical Boy whom he had abused: This is that Pope who said he would have his Pork (forbidden by his Physitian) in despight of God; and maintained he had more reason to be angry for the keeping back his cold Peacock Pye, than God had to cast *Adam* out of Paradise for eating an Apple: such a blasphemous as well as luxurious Wretch was he! Thus *Prideaux.* I shall add but two instances more, of two famous Women, one a Pope, and the other a Popess: The Woman-Pope was Pope *Joan*, who succeeded *Leo* the Fourth, sate in the Papacy two years and six months, supposed to be a man, until at length being with Child, she fell in labour in the midst of a solemn procession, whereby her Sex and lewdness were discovered together: hereupon there was an Image of a Woman with Child set up in the same place, where the Pope was delivered both of her Child and her Life: Ever since the Popes when they go to the Laterane shun that Street, although the nearer way, in abhorrency of the fact, and memory thereof. There was moreover a Chair of Porphiry-stone kept in the Laterane, with a hole in the midst to try the Sex of the new-elected: No less than fifty Popish Writers testifie the truth of this History concerning Pope *Joan.* The other Woman was a Popess, as the Pope himself called her, namely, *Donna Olympia*, the Sister-in-law and Mistress of Pope *Innocent* the Tenth, who was perfectly at her devotion, not only in his younger years, and whilst he was Bishop and Cardinal, but also in his elder years when he was Pope, and so continued until the very last: the History we have at large, written in *Italian* by *Gualdi*, and translated into *English*; the Book is called, *The Life of* Donna Olympia Maldachini, *who Governed the Church during the time of* Innocent *the Tenth.* In the Preface of the Book there is this passage: *By the great example laid before us, they must needs confess that the Church-men of the Roman Faith will do any thing with a Woman but marry her.* I shall refer the Reader unto the History, which relateth the great familiarities between this *Donna Olympia* and the Pope, having been too long in relating the viciousness of his Predecessors, although I have passed by many persons and things which might without wrong be spoken concerning them. I must add something concerning the filthiness and uncleanesses of the Popish Clergy, and others under the Celibate Vow. *Platina* doth record, that in Pope *Gregory* the Great's time there were six thousand Infants Skulls found in a Fish-pond at *Rome*; and what did this signifie, but the Whordoms and Murders which this Celibate Vow was the occasion of? *Nicholaus de Clemangis*, a Popish Archdeacon, who lived and flourished in the year One thousand four hundred and seventeen, he wrote a Book, *De corrupto statu Ecclesiæ*, wherein he taketh notice of the viciousness of all sort of persons, besides the Pope, that were under this Celibate Vow. *Cap.* 12. Concerning the Cardinals, these are his words: *Nec enumerare volo eorum adulteria, stupra, fornicationes*

quibus

quibus Romanam Curiam infeſtant, nec referre obſcœniſſimam illorum familiæ vitam, a dominorum tamen moribus nullatenus abſonam. I will not relate the Adulteries, Rapes, Fornications, whereby theſe Cardinals do pollute the Court of Rome, *nor ſet out the moſt filthy life of their Family, not at all diſſonant from the Manners of their Maſters.* Cap. 19. Concerning the Prelates, he thus writes: *Qui totos in aucupio, & venatu dies agunt, qui noctes in conviviis acuratiſſimis, & choræis cum puellis effœminati inſomnes tranſeunt, qui ſuo turpi exemplo gregem per devia abducunt in præcipitium. The Prelates ſpend whole days in fowling and hunting; and being effeminate, they ſpend whole nights in dancing and ſports with young women, and by their filthy example lead their Flock out of the right way upon a precipice.* Cap. 20. He calls the Regulars *Ebrios, incontinentiſſimos, utpote qui paſſim & inverecunde prolem ex Meretrice ſuſceptam, & ſcortam vice conjugum domi tenent. Et hos Canonicos aliquis vocabit, qui ſic ab omni Canone ſeu Regula ſunt abalienati? Drunkards, and moſt incontinent perſons, who ordinarily and ſhamelefly do keep Whores inſtead of Wives and Children by them at home in their houſes. And who will call them Regulars who walk by no Rule?* Cap. 21. Of the Monks he ſaith, *Quanto magis continentes, magis obedientes eſſe debebant minus vagabundi, & e Clauſtrorum ſeptis rarius egredientes in publicum; tanto ab his omnibus rebus licet eos videre magis alienos: pro labore deſidia, pro continentia & æquitate, libido & ſuperbia invaſere. By how much the more they ought to be continent and obedient, by how much the leſs they ought to wander about, and go forth into publick from the bounds of their Cloiſters; by ſo much the more we may ſee in them a contrary carriage and courſe unto theſe things: in ſtead of labour, ſloth; in ſtead of continence and juſtice, luſt and pride hath invaded them.* Cap. 22. Of the Mendicants he writes, *An non hi lupi rapaces ſunt ſub ovili imagine latitantes, qui more Sacerdotum Belis in ſuis penetralibus, oblata devorant mero & lautis epuils cum non ſuis uxoribus, licet ſæpe cum ſuis parvulis, avide ſatiantes, cunctaque libidinibus, quarum torrentur ardore, polluentes? Are not theſe Mendicants ravening Wolves under the form of Sheep, who like the Prieſts of* Bell *do devour what is offered, with others Wives and their own little Ones, greedily ſatiating themſelves in retired places with Wine and coſtly Banquets, and defiling all things by their filthy and burning luſts?* Cap. 23. Concerning Nuns and their Monaſteries, he thus expreſſeth himſelf: *De his plura dicere verecundia prohibet, ne non de cœtu Virginum Deo dicatarum, ſed magis de lupanaribus, de dolis & procacia meretricum, de ſtupris & inveſtuoſis operibus dandum ſermonem prolixe trahamus. Nam quid obſecro aliud ſunt hoc tempore puellarum Monaſteria niſi quædam. Non dico Dei ſanctuaria, ſed Veneris proſtibula, ſed laſcivorum & impudicorum juvenum ad libidines explendas receptacula? ut idem hodie ſit puellam velare, quod & publice ad ſcortandum exponere. Modeſty doth forbid to ſpeak more concerning theſe, leſt in ſtead of ſetting forth a ſociety of Virgins devoted unto God, we ſhould de-*

ſcribe

scribe a Stews, and speak of the deceits and wantonness of Harlots, of Rapes and incestuous works. For what other are the Monasteries of young women in these times, than execrable Brothel-houses of Venus, *than the Receptacles wherein immodest and lascivious young men do fulfil their lusts? and at this day it is the same thing to put a Maid into a Monastery, and publickly to prostitute her, or put her forth to be a Whore.*

We see what kind of persons Celibate persons were formerly, how well they kept their Vow of Chastity, as one of themselves acknowledgeth; and have we reason to think they are grown better of later years? We see what they have been in other Countries; let us also see what they were before the breaking off the Romish Yoke in our own Land. In King *Henry* the Eighth's time a search was made into Monasteries and Religious Houses concerning the Life and Manners of these Romish Votaries; and we shall find in *Speed*'s History of *Great Britain*, a Catalogue of vicious Celibate persons there found out, their Names and Crimes. In *Battle-Abby* fifteen Sodomites. In *Canterbury* eight Sodomites, and one that kept three Whores. In *Chichester* two Sodomites, in the Cathedral Church one that kept thirteen Whores. In *Windsor*-Castle twenty five Whores were kept amongst them. In *Shulbred*-Monastery nineteen Whores were kept. In *Bristol* the Abbot kept four Whores. In *Mayden-Bradly* the Prior kept five Whores. In *Bathe*-Monastery one had seven Whores, and was a Sodomite. In *Abingdon*-Monastery the Abbot had three Whores, and two Children by his own Sister. In *Bermondsey*-Monastery *John White* Prior, called the Bull of *Bermondsey*, had twenty Whores. *Fuller* in his History of Abbies doth relate this story: *One Sir* Henry Colt *of* Neither-Hall *in* Essex, *much in favour with King* Henry *the Eighth for his merry conceits, suddenly took leave of the King late at night, promising to wait upon his Grace early the next morning. Hence he hastned to* Waltham-Abby, *being informed by his Letters that the Monks thereof would return in the night from* Cheshunt-Nunery, *where they had secretly quartered themselves; Sir* Henry *pitcht a Brick-stall (wherewith he used to take Deer in the Forrest) in the narrowest place of the Marsh, where they were to pass over, leaving some of his Confederates to manage the same. The Monks coming out of the Nunery, and hearing a noise made behind them, and suspecting to be discovered, put out the light which they had with them, whose feet without eyes could find the way home in so used a path; making more haste than good speed, they ran themselves all into the Net: The next morning Sir* Henry Colt *brought and presented them to King* Henry, *who often had seen sweeter, but never fatter Venison.* I might add many more instances had I room and time; but I list not any longer to rake in this Dunghill, being wearied my self in the search, I shall draw towards a conclusion, fearing lest I should trespass upon both the patience and modesty of my Reader. If my Subject did not naturally lead unto this discourse concerning the lewdness and wickedness of these Celibate persons,

ſons, and if I did not apprehend that ſuch diſcourſe might be of uſe, I would have paſſed by theſe things in ſilence.

Uſe 2. What hath been ſaid concerning the wickedneſs of the Church of *Rome*, occaſioned by this forbidding to marry, I hope may be a ſufficient caution unto all of you to take heed, and move you to abhor both the principles and practices of this corrupt Church. Indeed if any of your hearts be ſet upon filthy luſts, and the moſt abominable uncleanneſſes, and your Conſciences are ready under our Reformed Religion to moleſt and trouble you too much, ſo that you cannot without ſecret laſhes and ſtings within proſecute your hearts deſires, and gratifie your vile affections: If you have a mind like Swine to wallow in the mire of the moſt naſty filthineſs, and to get Indulgencies for ſuch practices, I would adviſe you to turn Papiſts, I know no better way that you can take to ſear and cauterize your Conſciences, that you may ſin with the leaſt controul. And you of the Female Sex, if you deſire more ſecretly to be naught, and to vail all with a Religious Cloak, you may acquaint your ſelves with the Prieſts and Fathers of this Church, who though they will not marry, yet they will ſtrain hard but they will gratifie ſuch an inclination in you; and to ſtop the mouth of your clamorous Conſciences, they will give you forthwith an Abſolution, yea and admit you unto the Communion. But if you would deny all ungodlineſs and worldly luſts; if you would live ſoberly, righteouſly and godly in the World, as the Word of God, and Grace of the Goſpel doth teach; if you deſire to be ſanctified here, and ſaved hereafter, abhor Popery, come not near the Tents of this wicked Church, leſt you periſh with them in the ruine which the Lord will certainly bring upon them. Drink not of the Cup of Fornication which the Whore of *Babylon* would put into your hands; Receive not the Mark of this Beaſt upon your foreheads: Read and conſider one Scripture, which ſpeaketh of thoſe which turn Papiſts, ſufficient to affrighten all from admitting and embracing this Religion by the fearful conſequences thereof; the place is, *Rev.* 14. 9, 10, 11, 12. *And the third Angel followed them, ſaying with a loud voice, If any man worſhip the Beaſt and his Image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the ſame ſhall drink of the Wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the Cup of his Indignation, and he ſhall be tormented with fire and brimſtone in the preſence of the holy Angels, and in the preſence of the Lamb; And the ſmoak of their torment aſcendeth up for ever and ever: And they have no reſt day nor night who worſhip the Beaſt and his Image, and whoſoever receiveth the mark of his Name.*

Uſe 3. Laſtly, you that are married Miniſters, and live with your Wives in holy Wedlock according to God's Ordinance; Value not the Popiſh Doctrine or Decrees which forbiddeth your Marriage: So long as God is for it, no matter who they be that are againſt it; ſo long as God's Word doth allow it, no matter though the Pope doth forbid it.

Only

Only let it be your endeavour to put to silence the ignorance and perverseness of foolish men, by being blameless, as well as each the Husbands of one Wife: Above all others, you that are Ministers, and have Wives, should be as if you had none in regard of all inordinacy of affection towards them; and let it appear unto all, that although married, you chiefly care for the things that belong to the Lord, how you may please the Lord. You need not care, or be concerned at the barkings of the impure Papists, like Dogs who bark at the Moon, so long as your Conversations do shine.

SER-

SERMON XVIII.

The Nature, Possibility, and Duty, of a true Believer attaining to a certain Knowledge of his Effectual Vocation, Eternal Election, and final Perseverance to Glory.

2 Peter 1. 10. *Wherefore the rather, Brethren, give all diligence to make your Calling and Election sure: for if you do these things, you shall never fall.*

THat I may the more effectually discharge the Duty incumbent on me, and the more fully confute that *pernicious* Errour of the Church of *Rome*; which hath declared, *That a Believers assurance of the pardon of his sin, is a vain and ungodly confidence:* It being (say they) impossible for any person to know that he is *now pardoned*, much less that he shall *continue* and *persevere* in the state of Grace; I have made choice of this portion of Scripture, as the Foundation of my present Discourse. Wherein it *must* be considered, that although *Controversial* and *Polemical* Treatises are usually *large* and *full*, yet the *few moments* allowed for our present delivery, and the *few Pages* allotted for the printing of this Discourse, necessitates me to manage things in a very contracted manner: So, as I must give you but only *hints* of some *Arguments on our side*, and also must *rather obviate* and *prevent*, than *formally answer* all our Adversaries *Objections*. Avoiding all unnecessary Amplifications, and popular Illustrations, which might make our stile more smooth and pleasant, I shall only deliver what may rationally convince *your Judgment*; leaving the exciting of your *Affections* to the more immediate Influence of the good Spirit of God.

Conc Trid. Sess. 6. Certitudo remissionis peccatorum est vana & omni pietate remota fiducia. Bellar. de Just. lib. 3. cap. 3. Primus Hæreticorum error est posse Fideles eam notitiam habere de sua gratiæ ut certa Fide statu aut sibi remissa esse peccata.

Briefly then, the words I have read are an earnest Exhortation to an excellent Duty. *The scope and division of the words.*

In which Exhortation, it will be very much to our purpose to consider: 1. The *Person* that gives the Exhortation: 2. The *Persons* to whom it is given: 3. The *Matter* exhorted to: 4. The *Motives* inforcing. The Person that gives the Exhortation, is the Apostle *Peter*, one eminent, 1. For his frequent Temptations: 2. For his great falls by these Temptations: 3. For recovery after those falls. 1. *Peter* was a person subject to frequent and violent Temptations unto sin; at one time the Devil had so transformed himself into *an Angel of light*, that he had almost thereby transformed *Peter* into *an Angel of darkness*: *Peter* thought he acted the part of a *Saint* and Friend to dissuade Christ from going to *Jerusalem*; but Christ intimates that *Peter* acted therein the part of a *Devil*, when he said to him, Get thee behind me, *Satan*: at another time, the Devil desired to *winnow Peter as wheat*, and you know how he was sifted in the High Priest's Hall.

1. *The person exhorting*, Peter.

1. *One much tempted.*

Matth 16. 23.

Luke 22. 31.

Peter was one that being tempted, had greatly miscarried, and fallen into gross sin; for you do not only read of his *dissembling*, and of his too great complying with the superstitious Jews in their Ceremonies and Worship, but appearing like a down-right Apostate renouncing of Christ, and forswearing any knowledge of him, *Matth.* 26. 24. He that shall consider the experience which *Peter* had of *Satan's power* and *subtilty*, and of his own *impotency* and *weakness*, (both which Considerations might afford Arguments against the possibility of Assurance) may at first wonder that *Peter* should ever attain to any Assurance himself; much more that he should be the Author of such an Exhortation as this to others. But *Peter* (as he had experience of Satan's malice, of his own insufficiency, so he) had experience, 1. Of the *prevalency* of his Saviour's intercession: Christ had prayed that *Peter's Faith might not fail* in the habit, although it did fail in the act. 2. He had experience of the Spirit's efficacy in working true sorrow and repentance for his great sin; and hence (in part) it is, that *Peter* is most fit of all men to encourage weak Believers against their despairing and desponding fears, and to put them upon endeavours after Assurance: moreover, *Peter* had received a Command from Christ, that when he should be converted, (*i. e.* recovered from his partial Apostacy) he should endeavour to strengthen his Brethren, and probably 'tis in obedience to this Command of Christ that he is thus earnest in this Exhortation.

2. *One foully falling by temptation.*

Gal. 2. 12, 13.

In this we deny not but that the Pope may be Peter's *Successor.*

3. *One recovered from temptation by Christ's intercession, and the Spirit's efficacy.*

Luke 22. 32.

Ibid.

The *Persons* to whom the Exhortation is given, are called in the Text *Brethren*; by which Title is not only expressed every true Believers *Dignity*, who is a Brother to the very Apostles themselves, (which Fraternity is infinitely more desirable than that Bastard Nepotism which some Romish Cardinals boast of) but also by this Compellation the *truth* of their Graces is declared. For the Apostle had before described them to be, 1. Such as had obtained *like pretious Faith* with himself. 2. Such as were indued with *saving Knowledge*. 3. Such to whom God had communicated *all things pertaining to life and godliness*. 4. Such

2. *The persons exhorted, true Believers.*

Vers. 1.
Vers. 2.
Vers. 3.
Vers. 4.

4. Such as God had *called to glory and virtue.* 5. Such to whom God had given exceeding great *pretious promises.* 6. Such as were made partakers of *the Divine Nature.* Lastly, Such as had escaped *the pollutions of the world through lust.* Vers. 5.

These are the persons who although they had obtained *pretious Faith*, yet had not attained *certain knowledge* of their own spiritual state, but were in a *possibility*, yea in a very great *preparation* thereunto.

It is an abominable falshood which *Bellarmine* boldly reports that we teach, that except men have Assurance, they are not true Believers, or shall they ever be saved: This is an impudent calumny: for if any particular persons *abroad* have thought that a special and full perswasion of pardon of their sin, was of the essence of Faith, let them answer for it; our Divines *at home* generally are of another Judgment: Bishop *Davenant* and Bishop *Prideaux*, and others, have shewn the great difference between *Fides* and *Fiducia*, between Recumbence and Assurance; and they all do *account* and *call* Assurance a *Daughter*, *Fruit* and *Consequent* of Faith; and the late learned *Arrowsmith* tells us, that God seldom bestows Assurance upon Believers till they are grown in Grace; for (saith he) there is the same difference between Faith of *Recumbence*, and Faith of *Assurance*, as is between *Reason* and *Learning*. Reason is the Foundation of Learning, so as there can be no Learning if Reason be wanting, (as in Beasts) in like manner there can be *no Assurance* where there is *no Faith* of adherence. Again, as *Reason* well exercised in the study of Arts and Sciences arises *to Learning*; so Faith being well exercised on its *proper Object*, and by its *proper Fruits*, arises to Assurance. Further, as by negligence, non-attendance, or some violent Disease, Learning may *be lost*, while Reason doth *abide*; so by temptation, or by spiritual sloth, *Assurance* may be lost, while *saving Faith* may abide. Lastly, as all men are *rational*, but all men are not *learned*; so all *regenerate* persons have Faith to comply savingly with the Gospel-method of Salvation, but all true Believers have not Assurance. Bell. de Just. lib. 3. cap. 3. Davenant de Cer. 37. Prideaux Cer. Sept. Tact. Sac. l. 2.

The Believers in the Text were in a state of Salvation, but wanted Assurance: hence, 3. The Apostle puts them upon *diligence* to attain it; which acquaints us with the matter exhorted to: where observe, 1. The matter *ultimately intended*, *viz.* The making of their calling and election sure. 2. The means *subserviently directed to*, *viz.* The giving diligence to attain it. 3. The order of directing their diligence, *first*, to make their calling, and *secondly*, their election sure; for no man knows any thing of his election *further* than he is assured of his being effectually called. 3. *The matter of Exhortation.*

4. The fourth and last part of the Text affords us the *Motives* by which the Exhortation is enforced, which are, 1. Either implyed in these words, *Wherefore the rather*; and if you look back upon the two next preceding Verses, you will find in them a double Argument, 1. *Ab* 4. *The Motives.* 1. *Implyed.*

Verſ. 8. *utili*, from the fruitfulneſs that accompany Aſſurance, *If theſe things be in you and abound, they make you that you ſhall not be barren or unfruitful in the knowledge of the Lord Jeſus.* 2. *Ab incomodo*, from a double danger, 1. Of growing more and more *ignorant* of Spiritual Truths. Mat. 4. He that lacketh theſe things is blind, (the word ſignifies purblind) purblind perſons do *ſee*, but they ſee *only things near at hand:* many true Believers are weak Believers; not ſo ſtrong-ſighted as *Abraham* was, Joh. 8. 56. that could ſee *Chriſt's day afar off:* unaſſured perſons are not able to Verſ. 9. look ſteadily to thoſe things that are to come. 2. There is danger of more frequent falling into actual ſin: For although God will not ſuffer them to fall into any habitual *cuſtom* of ſin; yet they are very *apt* to forget that they were purged from their old ſin, and ſo are ſo much the 2 Pet. 2. 22. more ready to *return with the Dog to the vomit, and the Swine that was waſhed to the wallowing in the mire:* not that any truly regenerate perſon doth ſo; *but*, there is a *moral tendency* in ſpiritual *ſloth* and *lazineſs* to procure ſuch *Apoſtacy*; 2. which is farther alſo *intimated* in this 10 Verſe, 2. *Motive expreſſed.* where you have the *Motive expreſſed* in the Text it ſelf, *If you do theſe things, ye ſhall never fall:* that is, live *you* in a diligent exerciſe of ſaving Faith till you come to Aſſurance, and *God* will make good his own 1 Pet. 1. 5. promiſe, that you *ſhall be kept by the power of God through faith unto Salvation*; Perſeverance being *deſigned*, *decreed* and *promiſed* by God in the behalf of all thoſe that he hath effectually *called*, and did eternally *elect*.

Stabilis eſt Dei gratia qua fulciuntur ergo immunes ſunt a periculo cadendi. Cal. in Loc.

The words thus opened, afford us theſe two general Propoſitions.

The firſt general Propoſition. That it is the priviledge of a *true* Believer, that it is *poſſible* for him to make his *calling* ſure for *preſent*, and thereby to become aſſured of his *election paſt*, and conſequently of his *perſeverance* unto glory *to come*.

The ſecond general Propoſition. That it is a Believers *duty* to give all *diligence* to make his preſent calling, paſt election, and future perſeverance *ſure*.

The firſt *general* Propoſition doth branch it ſelf into three *ſpecial* Propoſitions.

1. That 'tis poſſible for a true Believer to make his calling ſure. 2. 'Tis poſſible *thereby* to know he was *elected*. 3. And by both to become aſſured that he ſhall *perſevere* unto Glory.

The firſt ſpecial Propoſition. I begin with the firſt ſpecial Propoſition, That 'tis poſſible for a Believer to make his calling ſure: Here 'tis neceſſary that two things be *undertaken* and *performed:* 1. Explication: 2. Probation.

Explication. Two things are to be opened: 1. What is underſtood by our *calling*: 2. What is meant by a *ſure* calling.

1. *what is an effectual call.* *Queſt.* 1. What is to be underſtood by our calling?

Anſw. Calling *ſtrictly* taken is an act of a perſon declaring his deſire

of

of another persons approach and access to him: Thus the *Centurion* tells Christ, that he could say to one Servant, *Come*, and he *cometh*; and thus Christ bids the *Samaritan*-woman *call* her Husband, and *come* to him. But the word more *largely* taken, is used for *any* declaration of the *will* of *one* person to *another*, where *compliance* with that will is *required*. Thus 'tis said, that *Jacob called* his Son *Joseph*, when he declared his will to him, saying, *Bury me not in Egypt, and he made him swear:* and in this large sence God is said to call a Sinner, when he *reveals* his own *will*, and a Sinners *duty*; as when God calls him to repentance, to faith, to holiness, 'tis the work of *God* to make known his pleasure, and 'tis the duty of *men* to comply therewith.

Luke 7. 7. John 4. 16. Gen. 47. 29.

The word here *our calling*, is *nomen participiale*, and 'tis taken not *actively* for our calling upon God, as when 'tis sometimes put for all that worship which we perform to God, as in that phrase, *Then began men to call upon God:* but 'tis taken passively for God's *calling of us*, the nature of which act is fully expressed, 2 *Thess.* 2. 13, 14. *But we are bound to give thanks unto God always for you, Brethren, beloved of the Lord, because God hath chosen you from the beginning to Salvation through Sanctification of the Spirit, and belief of the truth whereunto you were called by our Gospel to the obtaining of the glory of the Lord Jesus.* That which I would have you observe at present from hence, is this, that the *preaching* of the *Gospel*, and the revelation of God's will therein, is *God's call:* so the Apostle saith, Ye were called by our Gospel, *i. e.* our preaching of the Gospel. But here we must distinguish that the call of God in the Gospel is two-fold: 1. In word *only:* 2. In word and power *conjoined*; so *Paul* distinguishes in 1 *Thess.* 1. 5. *Our Gospel came not unto you in word only, but also in power and in the holy Ghost, and in much assurance.* Now according to the different means which God uses in calling, so there follows a *different fruit*, success, or consequent of God's calling.

Gen. 4. 26. 1 Cor. 1. 2.

God's Call of two kinds.
1. *In word only.*
2. *In word and power both.*

Hence it comes to pass, that God's call sometimes is ineffectual, and sometimes effectual; so the same Apostle plainly declares in 1 *Thess.* 2. 13. *For this cause thank we God without ceasing, because when ye received the word of God, which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but (as it is in truth) the Word of God, which effectually worketh in you that believe.* Observe hence, that 'tis the *work* of God's Spirit in the heart, superadded to the *Word* of the Gospel, as spoken by men, that makes any call *effectual:* without this inward work, God may call, and the Soul will never answer. But when the Spirit co-operates with the Word, the Souls of the Elect become obedient unto God's call; *they so hear his voice as to live*; there is then an enlivening, yea, a creating power appearing therein. I grant there is a sort of men arising among us, that scoff at this great work of Regeneration, and deny the infusion of principles or habits of Grace; but we have not to do with these men (at this time) who have totally faln from the Faith, and are

Hence ineffectual, or effectual.

Prov. 1. 23. Joh. 5.

greater

greater enemies to the Cross of Christ than the Papists themselves. Sure I am, that *Thomas Aquinas*, that famous person whom the Church of *Rome* have Canonized for a Saint, tells us, that since there are some men induced with such habits which cannot be attained by the power of Nature, (because by them some men are fitted for the end of Salvation) therefore 'tis necessary that God be owned as the immediate Infuser of these habits. And he further adds, that as God produces some natural effects *without the help* of second causes, (as health is sometimes bestowed without the help of Physick) so God infuses habits of Grace *without* and *beyond* the power of *Nature*. And whereas this learned person foresaw that some men might here object, that God's infusion of these habits into *some* persons and not into *others*, doth plainly prove *discriminating* Grace; (which Doctrine of late hath been denied and derided by the Socinians and some others) therefore this Angelical Doctor makes his Confession *plainly*, that *he for his part* doth own *discriminating* Grace; and that he doth firmly believe, that God (agreeable to his own wisdom, and for reasons reserved to himself) bestows more Grace on some, than upon others: And that though it be most agreeable unto Man's nature, that *habits* should arise from frequent *acts*, and much exercise, yet God *may*, and *doth work such habits of Grace* in some Men, which Nature cannot work; and therefore he concludes that they are supernaturally produced. I have given you the opinion of *this Author* about an effectual call the more *fully*, because I am confident, that had some men (who oppose the infusion of habits) been *old* enough, or *diligent* enough to have perused the Writings of such a person as *Thomas Aquinas*, before they had divulged their own fond Notions and Opinions, they would (out of a kind of ambition to be accounted ὁμοψήφοι, like-minded with such learned men) not have made such an open scoff and derision of discriminating and effectual Grace; wherein they do not only contradict the express words of holy Writ, but also oppose the Doctrine of the most learned of the Fathers and Schoolmen, and that with a most bold, as well as blind confidence.

The Judgment of T. Aquinas *about infused habits of Grace.* 1. 2. Q. 51. Ar. 4.

1. Q. 12. Ar. 4.

1. Q. 12. Ar. 4. Non iniquus est Deus si inequalia equalibus præparat.

Chrysostom, Augustine, Bernard. *See* Catharinus *and* Eisengrenius de certitu. Gratiæ.

I must beg pardon for this short (but necessary) digression, because 'tis this effectual work of God's Spirit in regenerating the Soul by *infusing of habits of Grace*, which distinguishes an internal effectual call of God, from a meer external and ineffectual one; and this is the thing which is chiefly intended in the Text, to be made *sure*, *viz.*

That it might be known whether or no God hath so called thee by his Word, as that also he hath wrought in thee by his Spirit; whether God hath illuminated thy understanding, and inclined thy will, so as thou hast complyed with God's will, and hast answered his call; whether when God *did draw thee*, *thou didst run after him*; whether when God did *knock at the door of thy heart*, *thou didst open to him*; whether when *God did intreat and perswade thee to be reconciled to him*, thou didst consent; whether when he did woo thee, he did also win thee; whether

Can. 1. 4. Rev. 3. 20. 2 Cor. 5. 20.

whether when he invited thee to the *Wedding-Supper of his Son*, thou didst make *no excuse* or delay, but didst accept, and welcome, the offer of the Gospel with faith and love: all which if thou didst do, it did arise from the power of an inward call, being superadded to the outward call of the Word; the very *essence* of an effectual call consisting in the Spirit's regenerating the Soul, and giving a new heart, (which is Scripture-Language) or in the Spirit's infusing of new principles and habits of Grace, (according to the phrase of the Schools) so that now *by calling* here in the Text, you must *understand* an inward effectual change wrought in the heart by God himself in the work of *Conversion* and *Regeneration*, or the Spirits infusing of habits of Grace into thy heart. Luk. 14. 18. 2 Pet. 1. 4.

Quest. 2. What is meant by *sure* calling, or *wherein* consists the nature of Assurance? 2. *What is meant by sure calling.*

Answ. There is a *double* certainty of an effectual calling: 1. One, the certainty of it *in it self:* 2. The other, the certainty of it *unto us.* Certitudo duplex objecti vel subjecti rei vel spei.

1. Our calling is sure in it self, so soon as ever God hath effectually called us, *whether we know it, or know it not:* God may effectually call, and we may have surely answered God's call, and yet we may not be sure that God hath so called us, or that we have so answered; but yet our calling hereby is made *sure in it self*; and this the Schools call, *Certitudo Objecti*, the certainty of the *Objecti*.

2. Our calling is sure unto us, when we know that God hath effectually called us; and this the Schoolmen call, *Certitudo Subjecti*, the certainty of the *Subject:* the word in the Text signifies *firm*, *stable*, *steady*, and *fixed*, and sure; either, 1. as a *Building* is sure that hath a good Foundation; 2. or as a *Conclusion* is sure that is drawn from certain Premises: in like manner our calling may be said to *be sure*, 1. either when it hath the efficacy of God's Spirit as its sure Foundation; or, 2. when it hath the evidence of proper fruits, which are as good Premises or sure Arguments, from which we may conclude our selves to be effectually called. Βεβαίαν. *Thus* Plato *in* Tim. *saith, that God is both* Βεβαίως ὄν, *the most firm being, and* Βεβαίως γνώστης, *the most known being.*

That the Text hath respect both to *Subjective* as well as *Objective* certainty, is beyond all dispute with considerative men: for the persons here exhorted (as I have shewn) were true Believers, and consequently their calling was sure in it self before the Exhortation was here given to them to make it sure; and therefore the Exhortation must *chiefly* respect *subjective certainty*, as something to be *superadded* to objective certainty. Hence when *Bellarmine* would (from this Text) prove Justification by works, because in some Copies the words are read thus, Give diligence to make your calling sure διὰ καλῶν ἔργων, by good works; the most learned *Chamier* answers him, That granting the words be so read, (*Beza* owning that he had seen such a Copy) yet 'tis very *absurd* and *illogical* for *Bellarmine* to argue that mens *persons* are therefore justified. Chamier Panstrat. Tom. 3. Lib. 15 cap. 15.

justified by good works, *In Foro Divino*, (as the Jesuite doth contend) because (according to this Text) *mens calling* may be *justified* or made sure by good works *In Foro Conscientiæ*: for this there is no colour from these words, because when *Vocation* is said here to be made sure by good works, 'tis (saith *Chamier*) to be understood *primarily* and *properly* of subjective certainty; *ut constet esse efficacem, & ut ejus certitudo ostendatur signo proprio nempe bonis operibus*, that it may appear to be effectual, and its certainty may be manifested by its proper signs, namely, by good works, and in *that* sense we also own that men may be *justified* by works, *i. e. declared* so in Conscience: but by a sure calling in the Text, is chiefly to be understood a calling assuredly known by the subject to be an effectual and saving calling. See *Beza* and *Calvin* on the place.

Subjective certainty is of two kinds.
1. *Perfect.*
2. *Imperfect.*

Now this subjective certainty is two-fold: 1. Perfect: 2. Imperfect. *Perfect* subjective certainty is when a thing is *so* known, as it cannot be *better* known; or when the subject is so certain of the truth of a thing, as that he cannot be more certain of it, because he hath not the *least ignorance* of the thing, or the *least doubt* concerning it: this is perfect certainty. But here are three things to be noted: Let it be considered,

Note 1. There is no perfect certainty amongst men.
1 Cor. 13. 9.

1. There is *no such thing* as this perfect subjective certainty *in this world*, perfect certainty is only to be found in perfect men, and 'tis folly to say any men are perfect, or that there is any such thing as *perfect knowledge in this world:* The Apostle saith, *We know but in part*, and therefore it is impossible that we should be certain any more but in part, that is, *imperfectly certain.*

Note 2. Some imperfect certainty is proper certainty.

2. Another thing which I would have our Adversaries consider, is, that imperfect certainty, though imperfect, yet it may be *true and proper certainty*, and is in many cases to be accounted more than *conjectural* or meer opinionative knowledge. For instance, we are told by God himself, *that no man can find out the Almighty to perfection*; and the most holy men in the world have some Atheism remaining in them; yet I hope many men have a *true and certain knowledge* of God, although no man hath a perfect knowledge of him: so a man may have a *true* and *certain* knowledge that he is effectually called, although he hath not a *perfect* knowledge of it.

Job 11. 7.

3. Imperfect certainty hath these four properties.

3. Let it be considered, that the nature of imperfect subjective certainty, is always such a knowledge as hath these four properties: 1. 'Tis built upon, or drawn from most *certain proofs and evidences*; and therefore, 2. It is such as doth prevail against all irrational doubts; and, 3. It is accompanied or followed with proper fruits of undoubted certainty, (notwithstanding a *mixture* of *ignorance*, and some *impressed or indiscoursive fears* which may consist with it:) 4. 'Tis such as God doth own for true and proper assurance in holy Writ.

1. Founded upon assuring evidences.

1. When knowledge is built upon rational *assuring evidences*, then it ought to be accounted certain knowledge, *notwithstanding* some *irrational* and *unaccountable* doubts may arise. A man that walks upon the

Leads

Leads of a very high, but very strong well-built Tower, incompassed with Battlements, doth know *rationally* that he cannot fall; (and he is not rationally in any fear of falling) but yet when he looks from that heighth, he hath *irrational* fears impressed upon him; and yet such fears as these hinder not, but that he is *still* certain that he shall not fall, because he can rationally prove that he *cannot* fall: Thus a person assured of his effectual calling by good evidence, is *really* and *properly* certain; although possibly when he looks down from the *heighth* of future expected Glory, into the *Bottomless-Pit* of misery, (from whence he hath escaped) some indiscoursive or irrational fears and doubts may be impressed upon him, which may *lessen*, but not *destroy* assurance.

2. When assurance is actually stronger than diffidence, and doth certainly prevail against distracting fears, then it is to be accounted certain assurance, though it be still *imperfect*: the truth, and the degree of a Believers assurance, doth hold *proportion* to the truth and degree of his Grace; and by this proportion of one to the other, they do very much illustrate each other. Thus, first, there is an analogy between Grace and Assurance, in this, that as Grace may be *true*, although it be not *perfect*; so may Assurance be *true* Assurance when *imperfect*. Again, as where *Sin reigns*, there is *no* Grace; so where *Doubting reigns*, there is *no* Assurance: but as when Grace *prevails*, 'tis accounted true Grace; so when Assurance prevails over Doubts, 'tis to be reckoned true Assurance. *Lastly*, where Grace is perfect without Sin, (as in Heaven) there Assurance will be perfect without all doubt, and not till then. 2. *Prevailing over all rational doubts.*

3. When a true Believers imperfect assurance is accompanied with the *proper fruits* of true assurance, 'tis then true assurance. Such fruits as these: 1. *Inward peace and satisfaction of mind*, the feast of a good Conscience. 2. *Joy in the Holy Ghost.* 3. Power and strength over temptations. 4. *Victory over the World.* 5. Inlargedness of heart *in the love of God.* 6. *Delight* in his ways. 7. Ready obedience to his will. 8. Patient bearing of the Cross, and *rejoycing in tribulation.* 9. Freedom and *boldness of access to the Throne of Grace.* 10. A *Spirit of Grace and Supplication.* 11. *Dependance upon God in all states.* 12. Great expectations from him. 13. All willingness to go hence, *and a desire to be dissolved.* When assurance is accompanied or followed with such fruits as these, (and the assurance of many a Believer is thus attended) although it be not perfect, yet it is true and proper assurance. 3. *Followed with the proper fruits of assurance.* Phil.4.7. Gal.5.22. 1 Joh.5.4. 2 Cor.5.14. Psal.40.8. Job 1.21. Jam.1.2. Heb.4.16. Gal 4.6. Zac.12.10. Psal.62.8. Phil.1.23.

4. That assurance *which God himself owns* as true and proper assurance, and is *called so* by the Spirit of God in Scripture, is to be acknowledged *by us as such.* God hath given *divers names* to a Believers assurance, which speaks it properly *to be so.* 1. 'Tis called πληροφορια, a *sure perswasion*; *St.* Paul *saith, that he was perswaded that neither life nor death*, &c. *should separate him from the love of God*, Rom.8.38. 2. 'Tis 4. *Owned by God, and so called.*

called γνῶσις, certain *knowledge*: St. *John* saith, *Hereby we know that we are in him*, 1 John 1. 5. 3. Ἔλεγχος, an *evident probation*; so a Believers *faith is called the evident proof of things not seen*, Heb. 11. 1. 4. Ὑπόστασις, a substantial prepossession of Heaven; so Faith is also called by the same Apostle in the same place. 5. 'Tis called πληροφορία, a fulness of assurance both in *Heb.* 6. 11. and *Heb.* 10. 20. 1 *Thess.* 1. 5. A Believers assurance is owned by God, and said to be full, although not perfect. So that the Controversie between us and *Rome* is not,

Our Controversie with Rome *in this point is about the proper, not the perfect assurance of a Believer.*

1. Whether *perfect* assurance be possible, but whether *certain* assurance be possible; that is, whether a *well-grounded*, *prevalent* and *influential* assurance be not attainable. *Bellarmine* grants Believers may have a conjectural hope; we say true Believers may attain to proper assurance: Theirs grant an assurance of fancy; we contend for an assurance of faith: Theirs is an assurance of opinion; ours an assurance of knowledge. I confess the Philosophick Schools have divided all Argumentation into *Demonstrative* and *Opinionative*, and they divided all knowledge into perfect science, or meer conjecture; and hence arose two sorts of Philosophers amongst them: 1. The Δογματικοι, Dogmatists, who thought themselves *perfectly certain of every thing*, and doubted of nothing, but were as infallible as the Pope in his Chair. 2. The Ἐφεκτικοι, a kind of seekers that did restrain their assent, and *doubted of all things*; like the Popish Laity that are kept in the *dark*, and are *taught* to be blind: but the Protestants are of *an elective kind of Divines*, who know a *middle* way between both extreams, and therefore we do maintain a possibility of certain knowledge, while we own an imperfection also; there being various *degrees* of a Believers certainty, and of his assurance, and yet the lowest of them is more than moral conjecture or opinion. *Bellarmine* himself is forced to grant that there are three degrees of certainty; and although he doth not admit a true Believers knowledge of his effectual call into any of those degrees: yet I shall prove anon that a Believer may attain a very high degree of certainty therein.

In certitudine tres quasi gradus distinguuntur, &c. Bellarm lib. de Just. 3. cap. 2.

2. But let it be observed in the second place, that our Controversie is not about words or names of things: the Question is not, Whether a Believers assurance is to be called *certitudo fidei*, or *certitudo fiduciæ*, or *certitudo scientiæ*; whether an assurance of faith, or an assurance of confidence, or an assurance of sense or of knowledge, for indeed it is not properly any of these; but an assurance mixed, and arising partly from faith, partly from confidence, and partly from knowledge both of reason and sense.

2. Our Controversie not about words or names.

Justi securitas leonis instar dum quoslibet contra se Insurgere conspicit, ad mentis suæ confidentiam redit, & scit quod cum eos adversantes superet, &c. Greg. l. 31. Moral. cap. 23.

1. It may be called an *assurance* of confidence, in as much as the degree of an assured Believers faith and knowledge must be such as excludes all rational and *prevailing* fears and doubts, according as I have already shewn.

2. It may be called an *assurance of faith*, from that special interest that

that faith hath therein, in as much as no Believer can attain to assurance of Salvation, that doth not first *Fiducially* and by way of Application believe those *peculiar* Declarations of God's Grace and will in the Gospel, which are the *Foundation* of a Believers Salvation and Assurance; more especially these three Fundamentals. 1. The *way* of Salvation by Christ. 2. The nature and *properties* of saving Faith. 3. The certain *perseverance* of true Believers to glory.

2. 'Tis called an assurance of Faith, in as much as there must be an *actual complyance* with the way of Salvation by an explicite exercise of saving Faith upon Christ Jesus; a Believer demeaning himself towards Christ, as towards the *Mediator* of the New Covenant.

3. It may be called an assurance of knowledge, in as much as every assured Believer must first know what are the signs of true Faith, and secondly, must know assuredly that the signs of true Faith are in himself.

4. It may be called an assurance of sense, in as much as a Believer knows not only by way of rational proof, but also by way of spiritual, internal, and experimental sense, that the work of God's Spirit hath been effectual in a saving manner upon him: All which I shall verifie and make good by several Arguments, in the order and method following.

For proof of this first Proposition, I shall first argue from the *Concessions* of our Adversaries, that is, from some *special Articles of their Doctrine*, which (although we do not grant them to be true in themselves, yet they) do afford sufficient Argument for *Conviction of a Papist* in our present case; evincing that it is possible for a Believer to attain to assurance of his being effectually called.

2. *Probation.* 1. *Arg. from the Concessions and Articles of the Church of Rome.*

The first Doctrine of theirs which we shall take notice of, is this; They *grant and affirm* that a Believer may be assured of the pardon of his sins, by *extraordinary means*, by some *immediate* revelation, *i. e.* either by a voice from Heaven, or the Mission of an *Angel* sent from thence; but they deny it to be possible to know this by *ordinary* means, *i. e.* by the revelation of *God's will*, and of *man's duty* in Scripture, with reference to eternal life, although the *Mind* of man be savingly illuminated by the Spirit, and although *Conscience* be enabled thereby to compare a Believers heart and life with the Rule of the Word. Now I would fain know how St. *Anthony*, St. *Galla*, or St. *Francis*, (who (*Bellarmine* saith) were extraordinarily assured) could be *so well* assured by a voice supposed to come from *Heaven*, (which may be subject to many delusions of phansie, and to divers cheats and impostures by Men or Devils, especially when heard by one simple person only) as by the voice of *Christ Jesus*, who was sent of God to reveal the Rule of life, and by the voice of a *man's own Conscience*, assisted by the Spirit enabling a Believer to discern his agreement with that Rule. I *grant*, that God gave testimony unto Christ Jesus *by a voice from Heaven*: but

1. *Popish Doctrine, that assurance is possible in an extraordinary way, but not in an ordinary way.* See Bell. lib. 3: Just. cap. 5.

Matth. 3. 17. Luke 3. 22. Joh. 12. 28. observe, 1. This voice was frequently repeated: 2. It was given in the hearing of multitudes: 3. God did speak *nothing* from Heaven immediately, but *what* he had *tanta mount*, spoken before in the Scripture: Joh. 5 29. Hence it is that Christ appeals not to this voice, but bids men *search the Scriptures, for they testified of him*; and when Christ tells his followers Joh. 5. 36. again, that God had given testimony of him, *he makes mention of the works* that the Father had enabled him to do, but makes no mention of his voice.

And as for assurance *given by Angels*, it must needs fall short of the assurance *given by the Spirit of God:* for the Apostle supposes that an Gal. 1. 8. Angel from Heaven *(i. e. Satan transforming himself into an Angel of light)* may preach false Doctrine, and be *accursed*; which is blasphemy to suppose of the Holy Spirit. Hence also our Saviour intimates in Luke 16. 29. the Parable of *Dives*, that *the Writings of Moses and the Prophets* in Scripture, are much more convincing and assuring, than the words of *one arising from the dead*, or one sent from Heaven. If men may then be assured in *Bellarmine*'s extraordinary way, they may much better be assured by the ordinary way revealed in Scriptures.

2 *Popish Doctr. That one man may be assured of anothers Salvation, but not of his own.* Marcellinus Cervinus.

The second Popish Doctrine is this, They say that one man may be assured of anothers Salvation, but that no man can be assured of his own: The Pope declares that he was sure of *Bellarmine*'s Salvation *when he Canonized him for a Saint*, but *Bellarmine* was not sure of his own Salvation himself when he died; for his own Nephew relates that he trembled at the thoughts of death; and that when some standing by desired him that he would pray for them in Heaven, he answered, That for his part he knew not (when he was just expiring) *whether ever he should come there.* Now of all sorts of men the Church of *Rome* ought to grant assurance possible to Believers themselves, when as the Pope hath declared himself to be so infallibly sure of the Salvation of so many millions whom he hath Canonized.

3 *Popish Doctr. That the Priest can give assurance by his word, but God cannot do it by his Word.*

3. They say that the Priest or Confessor can give assurance by his bare word, but deny God's Word to be any good ground of assurance: *Bellarmine* saith, that after Confession, the Priest *by the word of Absolution* doth give such evidence of justifying Grace, *as there can be no mistake therein*; these are his very words: here he mentions Confession as *a help* to assurance; yet afterwards he makes assurance to depend *wholly on Absolution:* for he saith it may often happen that a man may confess *few or none of his sins*, and yet the *Priest* may *assure him* of pardon, and he ought so to believe. You see here that the Priest can give assurance, and *assurance of faith* also; but with him the Word of God can give *no* assurance at all, much less of faith. The Jesuite will acknowledge that some *dark conjectures* or opinions may be built upon the Word of God, but no assurance; for he boldly, impiously and blasphemously

Confessio pœnitentis & verbum absolventis sunt signa Gratiæ Justificantis practica & efficacia adeo ut falsa esse non possint, Bell. de Pœn. Quis aperiat,

Lib. 1. Cap. 10. Facile potest accidere ut viz. minimam partem suorum criminum & tamen vere absolvitur, & certo absolutus creditur. Bell. de Pœn. Lib. 3. Cap. 21.

faith,

saith, That the certainty of those things that are believed in the Word, is only dark and obscure, like that of opinion: Thus he intimates, as if God could not, but that the Priest could assure: This is as if *Cornelius* should have disbelieved what *Simon Peter* spake to him *in the Name of God*, and should have believed *Simon Magus* whatever he spake in his own or the Devil's Name. Let all men judge whether if the Priest may give assurance by his word, whether God cannot do it by his Word much more infallibly.

Obscura est certitudo earum rerum quæ solo Fide vel opinione Nituntur. Bell. de Just. Lib. 3. Cap. 2.

4. They say men may attain to perfection, and yet not to assurance: the words of *Soto* are these: 'Tis possible for us so in this life to fulfil the whole Law of God, and the Precept of Love, that we may avoid all and every mortal sin; (by mortal sin, he means (as *Luidamus* interprets) whatever may lessen or violate our friendship with God.) Now if men may be thus perfect, certainly then they may know that they are thus perfect, otherwise they could be perfect without perfection; it is therefore a contradiction to say that men may be perfect, and not assured.

4 *Popish Doctr. They say men may attain perfection, yet not assurance.*

5. The Church of *Rome* say that men may attain to works of merit and supererogation: I ask whether works done *ignorantly and without knowledge* of rule or end, can be meritorious? Whatever act is blindly and casually performed, is so far from being a *meritorious* act, as it is not a *moral act* of obedience or service: If then men could perform any work of merit or supererogation, they must know *first* that they are sincere and accepted of God as upright, *before* they can imagine that their works shall be rewarded as meritorious. Yet our Adversaries teach, that men cannot be assured of acceptance, and yet they may not only be perfect, but may be more than perfect, (so supererogation implies) that is, that *they be righteous over much*, or they may be not only *good*, but *too good*, (which we will grant in the proverbial sense) they mean by it, that men may be so righteous and so good, as to purchase pardon for a thousand of *other* sinners, and yet may remain unassured of *their own* pardon. Is not this strange Doctrine? Would you then know the reason why the Church of *Rome* holds these absurd opinions, and seek to maintain that both parts of a contradiction are true as in our *present* case they do, (and I could evidence it by many *more instances*) to satisfie you about this spirit of contradiction, I shall at once open the whole mystery of iniquity, and give you a *Golden Key* whereby you may unlock their more hidden contrivances; a Key of *more worth* than any of those which the Pope holds in his *hand*, or wears at his *girdle*; by which he opens the *Treasures* of all his *inslaved* Vassals at his pleasure: the *print of our Key* you have drawn by the Apostle *Paul*, 1 *Tim.* 6. 3, 4, 5. whither I must remit you; *only* let me tell you, that *the more* you *search* into the Romish Religion, the more

5 *Popish Doctr. They say men may merit, and yet not know they are sincere.*

Pietatem quæstum ducunt illi, &c. *Those count gain godliness, who think the Oracles of God are given to no other end but to serve their Avarice, and measure all Religion by their own profit.* Calv. in 1 Tim. 6. 3, 4, 5.

you

you will *find* it calculated *only for gain.* Assurance is therefore denied by them to be ordinarily possible, because could the *Laity* attain to it without the *extraordinary* assistance *of the Priest*, the price of *Pardons*, *Indulgencies* and *Absolutions* would exceedingly fall: but although *with them* the Scripture be an *insufficient* thing, yet *Money* assures all things; and at *Rome* you *may buy* (if you be rich enough) not only *assurance*, but *perfection*, and *power of merit*, and *works of supererogation*, and what not? but no more of this.

2 Arg. From the Nature, Use and End of the Holy Scripture, which are a good Foundation of assurance.

My second Argument to prove that 'tis possible for a Believer to attain to a certain knowledge that he is effectually called, shall be from the *Nature*, *Use* and *End* of the *Holy Scriptures:* If Scripture be a good *Foundation* of assurance, then assurance is *possible*; but Scripture is a good Foundation of assurance upon a *double account*; 1. As the matter revealed; 2. As to the manner of revelation.

1. As to the matter of them, viz. The Grace of God in Christ.

1. Scripture is a good Foundation of assurance, if you consider the *matter of Scripture-revelation*; the sum and substance of all Scripture-revelation, is *the manifestation of God's Grace in Christ Jesus unto sinners*; *viz.* that *God so loved the world, as that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believes in him should not perish, but have everlasting life*, 3 Joh. 16. or in fewer words, *By Grace we are saved through faith, and that not of our selves, 'tis the gift of God*, Ephes. 2. 8. or in one word, *Grace* is the chief matter of Scripture.

Now *God's Grace*, as it is revealed in Scripture, is a good Foundation of assurance *upon two accounts:* 1. As it is *free* Grace: 2. As it is *engaged* Grace.

1. Scripture reveals free Grace.

1. The Scriptures reveal the Grace of God in its *freeness*, and so it affords a good Foundation of assurance: were sinners to be justified by *works*, or by their own *merits*, assurance were *impossible*, but *it is by Grace that we are saved*, i. e. by the merits of our *Mediator:* God freely accepts of that expiation which Christ hath made by the sacrifice of his own bloud upon our account. The *Papists* that hold Justification by works, *must necessarily deny* the possibility of assurance: for if Justification were by works, *then if* a Believer should keep the *whole Law*, and fail but of *one particular*, he were guilty *of all*; in *that case* therefore no man could attain to assurance, for *in many things we offend all.* But blessed be God, Believers are *not under the Law, but under Grace:* Now *Grace* accepts (for Christ's sake) *sincere* obedience, where no *perfect* obedience can be performed. Where-ever sin is neither *deliberate* or *habitual*, it *cannot* weaken a Believer's evidence; neither *ought* the *imperfections* of Believers to hinder their *assurance*, because the Grace of God in Christ is free, accepting satisfaction from Christ.

Jam. 2. 10.

Jam. 3. 2.

Rom. 6. 14.

2. Scripture reveals Grace engaged.

2. The Grace of God revealed in Scripture is a good Foundation of assurance *as 'tis engaged Grace*, that is, as it is Grace revealed in a *Covenant* or *Promise:* Grace as to any merit of *ours* is *free*, but as to the *promise* of God it is *engaged*; and as assurance were impossible were not Grace

Grace *free*, *i. e.* were Believers still under *a Covenant of works*; so assurance were impossible still if Believers were under *no Covenant*-Dispensation at all. Believers could have no hold of Grace, (were it never so free in it self) had not God given us assurance of his Grace in the *Covenant*, and *bound* himself by promise. I know some men do highly magnifie the essential *goodness* and *kindness* of God as the ground of a natural faith. I grant that this Divine benignity and goodness doth afford some lesser *hope* or *expectation* of pardon, but it gives no *solid* ground of assurance. The essential bounty, goodness and mercy of God, is like a *deep* and *wide Ocean*, upon which the mind of man may (as a Vessel at Sea) bear it self up in a *calm*; but if a *storm* arise, every wise Pilot will make towards the shore, or to a *safe Rock*, because 'tis *there* only he can find good *Anchor-hold:* Grace in a *Covenant*, or in a conditional *promise*, may seem to be Grace *bounded* and *limited*; but yet *hope* even *there* hath better anchorage than it hath upon God's general Grace and Philanthropy, which may bear up the Soul in a *calm*, but afford *little peace* to an *unquiet* mind: 'Tis the *Rock* of our Salvation revealed in the *promise*, that only *can stay that* Soul which is once *throughly awakened* and *convinced* of guilt. Now the Scripture doth reveal God's Grace engaged by Covenant to accept for *Christ's sake* all those that do depend upon his Son's merits, and *obey his Commands* by an effectual faith.

3. And that is another thing revealed in the Word, *viz.* The nature of that faith *by which* Believers do obtain an interest in God's Grace *through Christ*; and upon *this account* the Scripture is a good Foundation of assurance, in as much as, 1. It reveals *certainly* and *undoubtedly* that by faith in Christ we have an interest in God's most *free* and *promised* Grace. 2. That it reveals *certain* and *undoubted* marks of the nature of *true faith* in Christ. If then a Believer be by the Word informed that through faith in Christ he may certainly obtain pardon of sin; and if he be also *sufficiently* therein taught how to discover unfeigned from feigned faith by those certain κριτηρια or γνωρισματα which are laid down in the Word; what can *hinder* the possibility of a Believer's assurance? Especially if you shall consider in the second place the *manner* of Scripture-revelation, which proves it to be a *good* Foundation of assurance, in that it is, 1. full, 2. plain, 3. assuredly divine, 4. designed for assurance.

3. *Scripture reveals the nature of that faith whereby a Believer attains an interest in Christ.*
2 Joh. 16.
Jam. 1. 17, 18.
1 Tim 1.

2. *The manner of Scripture-revelation shews it to be a good Foundation of assurance.*

1. Scripture-revelation of the way of life is *full*; that is, all things necessary to be known both for *Salvation* and for the *furtherance of assurance*, are *fully* revealed, so as there is *nothing* wanting.
Joh. 15. 15.

2. All things are revealed *plainly*, *clearly*, and so *intelligibly*, as that the lowest capacity may reach and *know* the will of God *so far* as concerns *Salvation*; and he that is *humble* and *obedient*, may understand whatever is necessary to be known concerning *Salvation* or *Assurance*,
Joh. 7. 17.

3. All

3. All things are abundantly assured to us to be of divine Authority, God having been pleased to set the Seal of Miracles to the Patent of every Ambassador sent by him, and have attested the Commission of every Pen-man of Scripture, as appears *Heb.* 2. 3,4. But I do omit the full proof of the *sufficiency*, *perspicuity* and *divine Authority* of the Scripture, because it is so abundantly done by others in the Discourses annexed.

A fourth property of Scripture-revelation is this, that it was revealed to *this very end* that men might *attain* to assurance thereby; so we are frequently told by God himself, *viz.* That *whatsoever things were written, were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope*, Rom. 15. 4. And lest any one should think that the Spirit of God *by hope* doth only understand a conjecture, (as *Bellarmine* interprets the place) the Apostle *John* doth tell us, that the *express design* of his Epistle was, that those who believe might not *only* hope, but *know they had eternal life*, 1 Joh. 5. 12. and Christ himself tells Believers that he spoke all *those things that they might have joy, and that their joy might be full*, Joh. 15. 11. and the Author to the *Hebrews* gives us *this very account*, why God did not only *make* a Covenant of Grace, but did also *confirm* and ratifie it by an *Oath*, namely, *That Believers might have strong consolation*, or assured comfort. From all which 'tis evident Believers have a good Foundation of assurance *in* and *by* the Word. And moreover 'tis evident that the Word was *designed* for this end. Now the Rule is *most true*, *Deus & Natura nihil moliuntur frustra*, God and Nature design nothing in vain.

Bellarm. lib. 3. Just. cap 3.

Heb. 6 18.

Christ is Fundamentum Quod, *Scripture is* Fundamentum Quo.

2 Arg. From the nature of man's faculties and power of Conscience.

As God hath given Believers a good Foundation of assurance in the Word, so he hath given them *sufficient help* and *power* rightly and assuredly to *build upon* that *Foundation*, in as much as he hath indued them with *such faculties* as are able to *observe*, *discern* and *judge* of their *regular building* upon that *Foundation:* that is, God hath enabled them to discern *certainly* whether their *hearts* and *lives* agree with the rule of *faith* and *manners*. If God had creat. the *Sun*, but had denied men *eyes*, no man could have known the *path* which he *walks in*, or have *discerned* the *end* which he aims at: but God hath given both *light* streaming forth from *the Word*, and he hath given the *eye* of Conscience, that by *both* these men might come assuredly to know that they are *called out of darkness unto light*, and that they *walk in that narrow way that leads to life*, because they always make Salvation the constant white and mark of their way. The Church of *Rome* perverts all true Religion *at once*, and destroyeth all rational obedience to God's *command*, as well as they do undermine *all the best joys and comforts* of a good man's life, while they deny that any man can know assuredly what it is which he *chuses for his portion*, or what he doth *mostly prosecute*, or what is the *chief bent*, but their denying *the possibility of assurance, all men ought to reject communion with them.*

Ephes. 5. 8.

Mat. 7. 14.

Luther *faith, that if there were no other errour in* Rome Luther *in* Gen 41.

frame

frame or complexion of his heart, or what is the *tenour or course* of his life and conversation; whereas there are *few* persons living that bear not about them in their *own breasts* a convincing Argument from the testimony of Conscience, how much the general Conversation of *some* men *do depart* from the Rule of the *Word*, and how near *other* men (in the *tendency* of their lives) do *approach* to it. The dictates of *most men's Consciences* do tell them, how *great* a discerning they have of *good* and *evil*, and also of the *nature* of their *own actions: No man* can be *wholly* ignorant of the Law of God which is *written* in his own heart; and *few* men who live under the preaching of the Gospel, but are *conscious* of the *strivings* of the Spirit of God with them, and they *know* in *what* instance they have *complied* with its motions, and against *what calls* thereof they have *stopped* their ears: How much *more* then may *every true Believer* certainly know the saving work of God upon *him?* If an *unsanctified* person cannot *wholly* be a stranger to *himself*, surely then *the man* that dwells much at *home*, that frequently *descends* into his own heart, that *summons* his own Soul to *appear* before him, and to *come* to trial, this man cannot *easily* be ignorant what *agreement* there is between the *Rule* of God's Word, and the *method* of his Conversation. *Bellarmine* doth much urge that Text of the Prophet, *Jer. 17. 9. The heart of man is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked, who can know it?* If no man can *know his heart*, (saith the Cardinal) then none can *attain to assurance.* But we answer:

1. That though an *unregenerate* heart which is desperately wicked be *deceitful*, and not to be *known*, yet so are not the hearts of *true Believers.*

2. The Question is propounded of *one mans* knowing the heart of *another*, but not of a mans knowing *his own*; so *Peter Martyr* and others upon the place.

There are three Offices of Conscience which it is able to discharge, and thereby it doth exceedingly promote a Believers assurance.

1. There is in Conscience ὑπόληψις, by which power it is able to eye its Rule.

2. Συνείδησις, a power to compare man's actions with the Rule.

3. Κρίσις, a power to pass sentence or judgment either of *condemnation*, whereby it doth κατηγορεῖν, accuse; or of *absolution*, whereby it doth ἀπολογεῖν, excuse, as the Apostle speaks *Rom.* 1.

Conscience is both a Judge, a Witness, and an Executioner upon the tryal of man's heart and life.

1. Conscience is a Judge; I will not say it is a *King to give Law*, but it is *a Judge* to try and to pass sentence *according to Law:* Hence the Apostle *John* doubts not to say that the voice of Conscience is *one* and the *same* with the voice of God; *Hereby* (saith he) *we know we are of him in truth, and shall assure our hearts before him; if our hearts condemn us, God is greater than our hearts, and knoweth all things; but* 1. *Conscience is a Judge according to Law.* 1 Joh. 3. 19, 20, 21.

if our hearts condemn us not, we have confidence (even) before God: that person that is acquitted at the *Bar* by a *Judge*, acting according to Law, needs not fear to appear before the *King* himself on the *Throne*.

2. *Conscience a witness as to matter of fact.*

2. Conscience discharges the Office of a Witness; St. *Paul* calls it a witness, *Rom.* 9. 1. *I speak the truth in Christ, I lye not, my Conscience bearing witness*; and St. *John* gives it the same title, 1 *John* 5. 10. *He that believeth hath a witness in himself.* Heathens could say, *Conscientia mille testes*, Conscience is a thousand witnesses: but the Apostle speaks yet more, when he joins the Spirit of God as a co-witness with our spirits, *Rom.*8.16. *The Spirit it self beareth witness with our spirits, that we are the children of God.*

3. *Conscience is a rewarder or punisher according to sentence given.*

3. Conscience is a Rewarder or Punisher according to the nature of the sentence which it pronounces: if Conscience doth *accuse*, no such *severe* Tormentor as Conscience is, as is evident in the instances of *Cain*, and *Judas*, and *Spira*; if Conscience doth *acquit*, no such *Comforter* and *Rewarder*; this (saith *Paul*) is our *rejoycing, the testimony of our Conscience*, &c. no such *joy*, no such *feast*, as *the joy and feast of a good Conscience.* Well may it be said, that *a good man is satisfied from himself:* This bread is often eaten in secret; 'tis hidden Manna, and is so *much the more pleasant:* this is joy that a *stranger meddles not withal*, and is so much the more secure; the *new name and the white stone none know but those that have them*, even the sons of consolation.

2 Cor. 1. 12.
Prov. 15. 15.
Prov. 14. 14.
Prov. 9. 17.
Prov. 14. 10.
Rev. 2. 17.

4 *Arg. Because it hath been attained.*

4. Assurance is possible to be attained because it hath been attained, *ab esse ad posse valet consequentia.* 1. *Job* declares his assurance in that he saith, *He knew that his Redeemer did live*; *his*, (emphatically his, not anothers Redeemer) *his Redeemer* as to *eternal* as well as *temporal* concerns; so he describes him, *He shall stand on the earth at the latter day*, (the day of resurrection) *after worms had devoured his skin and his flesh*, then should he see him owning and receiving of him into Glory, *Job* 19. 25, 26. 2. *David* also was so assured of his interest in God, that he with assured confidence requires Salvation from God's hand; *I am thine*, (saith he) *therefore save me.* 3. Another instance of assurance we have in *Hezekiah*, who could appeal to God on a death-bed, *That he had walked before God in truth with a perfect heart, and had done that which was right in God's sight*; and 'tis evident his assurance was good, for God accepts of the appeal, and declares it to be true, *Isai.* 38.3,4. But the most convincing instance is that of *Paul*, in the 8. *Rom.* 38. where he declares so great a Plerophory of assurance, *that he was perswaded neither life, nor death, nor any other thing should separate him from the love of God.* The Romanists do variously excruciate themselves to evade the force of this Text, *some of them say the Apostle* speaks only of a *conjectural* perswasion, but *Pareus proves* that the Apostle never useth the word πέπεισμαι, *I am perswaded*, (with reference to his own Salvation) but he intends full assurance by it: so in 2 *Tim.* 1. 12. *I know whom I have believed, and am perswaded* (that is, I am assured)

Verf. 26.
Psal. 119. 130.
Stapleton. Vasquez.

that

that he is able to keep that thing I have committed to him unto the great day. God's power is not an object of *conjecture*, but of *knowledge* and *assurance.* *Others* of that Church say, that although *Paul* was assured that not any *Creature* could separate him from the love of God, yet he was not sure but *he* might separate *himself* by the apostacy of his own will. Of these men the learned *Chamier* doth well demand, Whether the Apostles *Will* were not a *Creature*; and also, Whether God cannot by his own *power* keep our *wills* to himself, after he hath made us of *unwilling* to be a *willing* people. For notwithstanding there may after conversion remain a *natural power* in men to alienate their hearts from God, yet by Christ's Mediationand the Spirit's superintendency in *true Believers*, there remains no *moral power* actually to do it. And further, since no *Creature* can do any thing towards our separation from God but by our wills, 'tis folly (saith he) to think that the Apostle doth not *include a Believers will*, when he saith, *No Creature shall separate* a Believer from God. *Bellarmine*, to avoid the Text, runs to his old refuge, and grants that *Paul* was truly assured, but it was by an *extraordinary revelation*, which no other Believer can *ordinarily* attain to: The folly of this evasion I have already *in part* detected; *two things* more I desire may here be considered. 1. That when any persons have declared *(in the Scripture)* their full assurance, they have *spoken* of it not as of a thing of *extraordinary* revelation, but as of a *thing* of *evident probation.* 2. That *yet* they have spoken of their *assurance* as of a *thing* of *as great certainty* as can be desired. For the proof of *both these*, I shall instance in the *Apostle John*, who *often* asserts his assurance: but, 1. He *reckons* it not grounded upon *immediate revelation*, but upon *rational evidence and probation*, his words are these, 1 *John* 2. 3. *Hereby* (ἐν τούτῳ) *we know* (saith he) that we know him, if we keep his Commandments: and again, 1 *John* 3. 19. *Hereby* (the same word is here used again) we know we are of him *in truth*, and shall assure our hearts *before* him: you see, in both places he speaks *Argumentatively*, not by way of *Revelation*; and yet observe, 2. That his assurance was *full* and *strong*, for it is expressed by words importing as great assurance as can be expected, γινώσκομεν ὅτι ἐγνώκαμεν, *scimus Quod novimus*, *We know that we know him*; and in the other Text the emphasis seems greater, *Hereby we know we are of him in truth, and we know we shall assure our hearts before him*; so that you see many Believers have attained to assurance, and therefore 'tis possible.

Salmero. Pererius.

Panstrat. Cathol. Tom. 3. Lib. 13.

Lib. de Just. 3. Cap. 5.

Ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκομεν ὅτι ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐσμέν, καὶ ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ πείσομεν τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν. 1 Joh. 3. 19.

'Tis possible to attain to assurance, because God hath designed our assurance in the instituting of these Ordinances, which do *properly* tend to the *begetting* and *increasing* of assurance: that is, God hath therefore *confirmed* his *promises* and the *Covenant of his Grace* by visible *signs* and *seals*, for the begetting and promoting *our* assurance of his love and favour to us: There could be no *greater* reason of the institution of *circumcision* and the *Passover* under the Law, and of *Baptism* and the *Lord's*

6 Arg. From the Institution, Nature, use and End of the Sacraments. Rom. 4 11.

Supper under the Gospel, than *God's intending* thereby the giving all *necessary* and *useful helps* and *furtherance* of subjective assurance. Hence it is that the Apostle *Paul* tells us, *That the promise and the blessing was sure (in it self) to* Abraham *long before he was circumcised.* It may then be enquired, to what *end* was Circumcision instituted? The same Apostle tells the *end* was, that it might be a ground of greater assurance; for so he saith, *Abraham received the sign of Circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of faith, which he had being uncircumcised:* Now unto this seal of *Circumcision* under the *Law*, the seal of *Baptism* answers in the *Gospel*; and as the striking of the *Blood of the Paschal Lamb* on the *door-posts* of the Israelites, gave *farther assurance* (after *the promise was made*) that the destroying Angel should not smite the first-born of *any Israelite*; so the Institution of the Lord's Supper was intended for a begetting the greater assurance in the heart of a *true Believer*, that God will not destroy him for the sake *of the Blood of his Son* that is thereby *represented*; both Sacraments being intended as *Seals* of the Covenant of Grace *more visibly ratifying* thereof to sense, and confirming *Faith* thereby. Moreover, God in the Sacraments doth confirm a Believer's Faith, in as much as he doth therein, by his Ministers, make a more *particular* and *personal* Offer and Application of his Grace to *every* true Believer. In the Sacraments there are to be considered, 1. The Confirmation; and, 2. The more special Application of the benefits of the *Covenant of Grace*; and by both these a Believers Faith is strengthened, and his assurance is promoted. It is one Argument that *Becanus* the Papist useth against the possibility of assurance, *viz.* because God hath not by *name* declared to any person that his sins are forgiven, any where in *Scripture:* but this Cavil and Objection we have already obviated, and told you that all universal and general Propositions do include singular and particulars: It is no where said, that *Thomas* or *John* shall not do any *murther*, or shall not *steal*; but the command is *as binding* as if they *had been named*; the case is the same in *Promises* as in *Commands:* but we might answer (*sano sensu*) farther with St. *Bernard*, That in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper there is an actual *Exhibition* and particular *Application* made of the Grace of God, whereby all true Believers are *personally* and *actually invested* into that Grace by a *direct* and *immediate assurance* given. The Father explains himself *thus:* The Priest (saith he) in the Eucharist doth as it were invest the Receiver with an assurance of pardon, as some men are invested into an Estate by a Rod or Staff, or as a Woman is invested into an actual interest in her Husband's Estate by her Husband's putting a Ring upon her Finger, or as a Canon is invested by a Book put into his hand, or as an Abbot is invested by a Staff. We do not say with the Papists, that the Sacraments do actually confer Grace by virtue of the external application: but we say that in the Sacrament there is an assured offer of Grace made to every Receiver, and unto all *true Believers* they do *sign*, *seal* and *assure* a *certain* and *undoubted* interest in

Rom. 4. 11.

Domino passioni appropinquans, Investiri suos de Gratia sua curavit, &c. Bern de Cœna Dom. Serm. 1.

Offerunt non conferunt, signant & obsignant.

in pardon. *Bellarmine* saith, That after the receiving of the Sacrament, as he calls it, of Absolution, very many Believers have, and all Believers ought to have a certain and confident assurance of pardon of sin: In which words of the Jesuite, I desire *three things* to be observed: 1. How openly and plainly *Bellarmine* contradicts himself. 2. How he hath incurred the *Anathema* of the *Trent*-Council. And, 3. How he hath conceded what we plead for. 1. This admired Doctor takes liberty to contradict himself, (as so great a Scholar may much better than another) for if you consult his third Chapter of his third Book of Justification, he there tells you that it is a gross errour to say that any Believer can have any such sure knowledge of their own Grace, so as that they can (by an assured Faith) determine that their sins are forgiven: but in the second Chapter of his third Book of Repentance, now quoted, you see that he had said before that after Absolution many Believers have, and ought to have an assurance of Faith that their sins are forgiven: if these things be not contradictions, I know not what are: some of his Friends would help him, by saying that there is difference between an assured Faith in one place, and an assurance of Faith in another; or between *certa fide statuere*, and *fiduciæ certitudinem habere*, if any one shall so distinguish; he will but farther discover his own folly, because *(certitudo fiduciæ)* assurance of Faith is (of the two) more *large* and comprehensive than *(certa fides)* which we translate sure Faith. *Assurance* or *Confidence* doth always *suppose* sure *Faith*, or certain *assent*, as the *ground*, *root* and *foundation* thereof. There may be *Faith* where there is no *Confidence*, but there can be no *Confidence* where there is no *Faith*: He that therefore saith, That 'tis possible for a man to be *assuredly confident* of the pardon of his sin, doth contradict *him* that saith, 'Tis not possible for any man *to believe* his sins are pardoned. *Bellarmine* by saying both these things doth plainly contradict himself. 2. But we shall wonder at this the less, because in the second place we may observe that he makes bold to contradict in most express terms his most holy Council of *Trent*; the words of which Council I quoted in the entrance of this Discourse; wherein they declare that *(certitudo fiduciæ)* assurance of *Faith*, or assurance of *Confidence* (translate it as you please) concerning pardon of sin *is vain* and *impious*: but *Bellarmine* saith that *many* Believers have (and all ought after Absolution to have) this *(certitudinem fiduciæ)* assurance of faith or confidence, call it by what name you will, yet the contradiction is direct: the same word being used by the Council and by the Jesuite. Now who can by any distinction reconcile these two contradicting Positions? and therefore I suppose none can free our poor Doctor from the *Anathema* passed upon him by the *Council*. For my part, I always thought a *Council* to be more infallible than the *Pope*, (though I will try before I will trust either of them) I am therefore *confident* the Pope did *err* when he made a *Saint* of this Cardinal, who we find accursed by the Council.

Post receptum Sacramentum plurimi fidelium habent, & habere debent fiduciæ certitudinem de remissione peccatorum. Bell. lib. 3. de Pœn. Cap 2. Primus Hæreticorum error est, posse Fideles eam notitiam habere de sua gratia ut certa Fide statuant sibi remissa esse peccata. Bell. lib. 3. de Justif. cap. 3. Fides est Fiduciæ Fundamentum, Fiduciæ est Fidei actus. Prideaux Lectio 7.

3. But

3. But we Protestants ought to pardon and absolve the Jesuite from this *Anathema*, pronounced for his contradicting the pretended general Council, *since* he doth not *in this* contradict the truth, but *doth grant all that which we plead for*, even almost in the *very words* and *terms* by which the Protestants them selves express it; for there is little or no difference between the very phrase which I have quoted out of *Bellarmine*'s second Book of Penance, and the very words of his Adversary *Chemnitius* in his Examen, *which are these*, That a *true Penitent*, or one that acts true Faith on Christ, may by *an assured confidence determine* that his sins are pardoned.

Peccator in seria pœnitentia ex fide in Christum possit certa fiducia statuere sibi remissa esse peccata Chemn. Examen, ad Sess. 6.

I shall conclude this Argument with *this note*, that if it be granted, that *after the pretended Sacrament of Penance and Absolution by a Priest*, a Believer may become assured of the pardon of his sin; he may *much better* conclude his sins to be pardoned after the right use of the Sacrament of the *Lord's Supper*, which was designed to be a Seal and Confirmation *to his faith.*

6 Arg. Because it is possible to attain to all assuring evidences.

The sixth Argument is this, 'Tis possible for a Believer *to prove* that he is effectually called, by *all assuring evidences*; and therefore 'tis possible for him to attain to a certain knowledge that he is effectually called. There are *three*, and *but three sorts* of assuring evidences: 1. Demonstrative Argument: 2. Unerring sense: 3. Infallible Testimony. Now 'tis possible for a Believer to prove that he is effectually called *by all* these several sorts of evidences.

1. By Demonstrative Argument.

1. By Demonstrative Argument, that is a *Demonstration* which proves *either* the *being* and *existence* of a thing by its *inseperable* and *distinguishing effects*, or proves the *nature* and *kind* of a thing by the *special* and essential properties of it. Now a Believer may prove that he is *effectually called*, or that he is *regenerated*, and that the Spirit of God hath *infused the habits* of saving Grace into him,

1. From the proper effects of infused habits of Grace.

First, by peculiar, proper, and distinguishing effects of infused habits of saving Grace: the effects of all *habits* are their *respective* acts; and although *all sorts of gratious acts* do not prove *habits* of true Grace, yet God hath declared in his Word that there are *some acts*, and *some exercises of Grace*, which do demonstratively prove infused habits of Grace, and do *evidence* an effectual call; this is proved by 1 *Thess.* 1. 3. compared with Verse 5. In the 5 Verse *Paul* tells the *Thessalonians*, *That the Gospel came not to them in word only, but in power also, and in the Holy Ghost, and much assurance:* that is, he tells them they were effectually called: but how may this be proved? what evidence is it built upon? See Verse 3. he proves it by *two* things: 1. By the indwelling habits of Grace, *viz.* Faith, Love, and Hope: 2. By the distinguishing acts of those Graces, *viz.* working, labouring and patience; *remembring* (saith the Apostle) *your work of faith, your labour of love, and patience of hope.* Now in the same manner (as *Paul* doth) 'tis possible for many true Believers to prove *Demonstratively* also the truth of *their* Grace. 1. They may

may prove the truth of their *Faith* by its *work*; the Apostle *James* saith, that works do *shew*, or (as the words signifie) *demonstrate* the truth of Faith: *all* sorts of works do not *prove* Faith to be saving, but *some* works do manifest it; and by them 'tis possible to prove an effectual call. I will name (and I must but name) some works of Faith, which are all as so many Demonstrations of true Faith. 1. Prizing the Lord Jesus above all things, *Phil.* 3. 8. 2. Receiving him in all his Offices as offered in the Gospel, *John* 1. 8. 3. Victory over the World, 1 *Joh.* 4. 4. 4. Quenching of Satan's fiery darts, *Ephes.* 6. 16. 5. Purifying of the heart, *Act.* 5. 9. Where-ever these works or effects of Faith are, there certainly is saving faith.

1. *The work of Faith,* δείξον, Jam. 2. 18.

1 Pet. 2. 7.

2. Love may be demonstrated by its labour, that is, by its exercise and peculiar fruits and effects. The word *labour* of *love*, mentioned by the Apostle, is used not to signifie any *irksomness* or *burthen* that love feels, for nothing more *delightful* and *pleasant* than the *work of love*; but to intimate the *diligence*, *constancy*, and *universality* of loves exercise: where love to God is sincere, there love commands the heart; the interest of God in such souls is superiour to all other Interests; hence *God's Commands are not grievous*; and this is a property of love, *that demonstratively proves* it to be the work of the *Spirit* in an effectual call: if the Apostle *John* had any Logick in him, he thought this to be a Demonstration, *That he that keepeth his Word, in him verily* (i. e. certainly, undoubtedly) *is the love of God perfected*; that is, Evangelically compleat and sincere. The nature of true love is such, that it will make it self manifest; if men would *design* to conceal it *from others*, 'tis difficult to be *hid*; but for a man to hide it from *himself* it is impossible: the consideration of which forces *Bellarmine* to confess, that love to God, or charity, is a most *certain note* whereby alone the Children of God may be *distinguished* from the Children of Satan. Thus again while our Adversary opposes the *possibility* of assurance, he doth contradict himself, and most fully grant it *to be possible*, because there are confessedly some *certain* marks and signs of the Children of God; and by *these* fruits they may be known: we have instanced in two Graces of *faith* and *love*; we shall instance but in one other, *viz.*

2. *Labour of Love,* κόπος τ ἀγάπης, 1 Thess. 1. 3.

1 Joh. 5.

1 Joh. 2. 5.

Bell. Lib. 4. Just. Cap. 15. *Charitas est ipsa sola certissima nota, Quæ filii Dei a filiis Diaboli decernuantur.*

Hope: this Grace may be *demonstratively proved* to be *wrought* by the Spirit in an effectual call, by that distinguishing effect or consequence of it, (which the Apostle mentions also in the fore-quoted place) *viz.* a *constant*, *patient submission* to the Will of God, in parting with *any* or *all* the *enjoyments* of this life, and in *bearing* whatever *affliction* God in his *Wisdom* shall think fit to *try* a Believer with. I do not say that either *hope* or *patience*, when *separately taken*, but *only in conjunction one with the other*, are certain signs of true Grace: there is a great deal of *presumption* or *false hope* in the World; but *false hope* is never followed with *self-denial*, or with an *intire resignation* to the Will of God, so as to forsake all and to follow Christ. On the other hand, there may be

3. *The patience of hope.*

some-

some kind of *patience* which may be nothing but a *Stoical apathy*, and a *senseleſſneſs* under ſufferings, or only a *blind boldneſs* to engage with difficulties. Now this often-times ariſes from pride, not from Evangelical hope, nor from a ſenſe of intereſt in the love of Chriſt. Now we do not ſay that ſuch hope or patience when ſo divided are certain Arguments of Regeneration, but they are only ſo in *conjunction*; and we ſay that patience, *when* 'tis a fruit of *Goſpel-hope*, 'tis then an effect of the Spirit's work, who hath infuſed that *hope* as an habit of ſaving Grace; and 'tis Demonſtratively proved to be ſo, becauſe this hope is of the ſame nature as ſaving faith, and it hath many evidences which certainly manifeſt it to be ſaving: 1. This hope *purifies the heart*, 1 Joh. 3. 3. 2. This hope *rejoiceth the heart*, Rom. 5. 2. 3. It aſſures the heart, *Heb.* 6. 11, 19. 4. It ſaves the ſoul, *Rom.* 8. 24. Now theſe effects are able to diſtinguiſh preſumption from *right hope*, and alſo Argumentatively to evidence an effectual call.

Our Adverſaries grant a certainty of hope, and therefore muſt grant a certainty of Faith; for Scripture uſeth often to ſpeak of both theſe as one Grace, and the Hebrew word בטח *ſignifies both to believe and hope.*

2. From the eſſential properties of ſaving habits.

2. 'Tis poſſible to prove by Demonſtrative Argument that the Spirit of God hath infuſed the habits of ſaving Grace into the heart by the ſpecial and eſſential properties of theſe habits. There are four properties of ſome *acts*, which do prove the exiſtence of *habits*; and do evidently ſhew, that thoſe acts and exerciſes do *flow* from *principles* or *habits*, either, 1. naturally, or, 2. acquired, or, 3. infuſed; and the four properties are theſe: 1. *Facility* and promptneſs, or preparedneſs to act. 2. *Delight* and pleaſure in acting. 3. *Univerſality* as to the object about which it acts. 4. *Conſtancy* as to continuance in acting. Now 'tis poſſible for a Believer to diſcern that the exerciſe of his Grace hath all theſe properties, and thereby he may demonſtratively prove that his Graces are habitual, and conſequently that they were infuſed in an effectual call, (for I have proved that they cannot be natural or acquired habits) and therefore they muſt be infuſed, that 'tis poſſible for a Believer to *attain* to theſe properties, and to *diſcern* them, I ſhall *briefly prove* (although I could be large) in the inſtance of *David*, who attained to, and diſcerned, 1. A facility and readineſs, a fixedneſs and preparedneſs in the exerciſe of his Grace, as you may ſee *Pſal.* 108. 1. and *Pſal.* 57. 7. 2. A joy, delight, and pleaſure in acting or doing the Will of God, *Pſal.* 40. 8. and *Pſal.* 119. 16, 35, 47, 70, 92, 143, Verſes. 3. An Univerſality in his Obedience, and in that reſpect which he had to all God's Commands, *Pſal.* 119. 6. 4. A conſtancy and continuance (not as to *every* particular, but as to the *general* courſe) of his Obedience, *Pſal.* 73. 25. *Pſal.* 119. 44, 117. That other Believers may attain to the ſame properties as *David* did, none can deny; and that they may diſcern them as *David* did, can be as little denied; and therefore 'tis poſſible to prove an effectual call by demonſtrative Argument. 2. 'Tis poſſible for a true Believer to prove that he is effectually called by

All theſe properties are comprehended in thoſe two words in Pſal. 51. רוח נדיבה *a free ſpirit,* רוח נכון *an eſtabliſhed ſpirit,* Maimon. more Nev.

2. Unerring ſenſe. The Lord ſaith, Every being is indued with ſenſe, even the very Elements: Eſt in quovis inarticulato & incanto Elemento, inſtinctus quidam Naturalis, Herb. de Veritate.

The Pythagoreans *thought it equal cruelty to cut off the branch of a tree, as to break the leg of an Ox, or the arm of a man, affirming that all trees were indued with ſenſe.* Diog. Laert. de vitas Phil.

an

an unerring sense. Every kind of life is indued with a *sense proper* to its *nature*; for there is a certain connexion between *life* and *sense*; and the more *high* and *noble* any principle of life is, the more *clear* and *perspicuous* are the *sensations* and *perceptions* of that principle. The senses of the *animal life* are evident, and the perceptions of the *rational life* are more discernable than they; but no sense so quick and clear as that of the *divine life*, because the principle thereof is more *high* and *noble*. Here possibly a *half-witted Pretender to Reason*, will *cry out*, That to discourse of *spiritual senses* and the perceptions of the *divine life*, is to speak nothing but *Enthusiasm*, and things which *none* understand. I answer, *Mounsieur des Cartes* was *far* enough from Enthusiasm; yet that Master of Reason builds all his *Philosophy* upon a principle of inward sense, *viz. Cogito ergo sum, I know I think*, therefore *I know I am*. And he farther tells us, That the Idea, or *inward sense* of a God, is the *best* Argument to prove there *is one*. Again, I ask were the Philosophers of old, *Plato* and *Aristotle*, Enthusiasts, who agreed in this, that all men are *naturally endued* with a double faculty of discerning? one they called, *facultas* διανοήτικη, a discoursive faculty; the other, *facultas* νοητική, an intellective faculty; by the latter of which, some truths (they said) were intuitively and directly see ἀμεταλήπτως, not by augmentation, but by internal sense; and this all men know and acknowledge who are self-acquainted in any measure. And agreeable hereunto the Spirit of God is pleased to *represent* the *perceptions* of the divine life by expressions of *sense*, as of *seeing the Just One*, Acts 22. 14. of hearing, and *learning of the Father*, John 6. 45. of *smelling a savour and sweet odour in Gospel-revelations*, 2 Corinth. 2. 14. of *tasting that God is good*, Psalm 34. 48. of *touching and handling the Word of Truth*, 1 Joh. 1. 1. Now as 'tis *folly* to strein Scripture-allusions too far, and to take its Metaphors in the literal and *proper sense*; so 'tis *madness* and *gross ignorance* on the other hand to think that by *these expressions* the Spirit of God did not *intend* to inform us, that every true Believer doth as *truly discern spiritual* objects by an *internal* sense, as any man doth discern *material* objects by his *bodily senses*.

Cartesius de Methodo.

Aristot. lib. 2. Post. cap. ult.

I shall instance but in *three acts* of divine sense, whereby 'tis possible for a Believer to prove sensibly that he is effectually called.

Three acts of sense, whereby a Believer may know that he is effectually called.

1. Many Believers do see such a *light* breaking in upon their understanding, as doth *manifestly declare* it self to be the especial work of God's own Spirit; for by *two properties* the teaching of *God's Spirit* may be *distinguished* from the common teachings of *men*, or from the *sole convictions* of a natural Conscience: 1. By the *clearness* and *fulness* of this light; when the Spirit co-operates with the Word, then a Believer in *God's light sees light*, as the Psalmist phraseth it, he sees eye to eye, as the Prophet *Isaiah* expresses it, *Isai.* 51. 8. Divine light is *full*, and *descends deep*, and enters far into the minds of men; Wisdom *enters the soul*, Prov. 2. 4. God *shines into the heart*, 2 Pet. 1. 19. And

1. *By discerning a divine light illuminating his understanding.* Psal. 36. 9.

hence truth is said to be *wrote*, *Heb.* 8. 10. to be *engraven*, 2 *Cor.* 3. 3. to be *sealed*, Job 33. 16. on man's heart and soul. 2. By its influence on *practice*; no truly divine teaching is or can *be detained in unrighteousness*; and hereby 'tis distinguished from common teaching; *Sun-light* is distinguished from Moon-light by its *brightness*, and by its warmth also, a meer natural conviction is like a flash of lightning in the night, which makes a *short* discovery of some objects, but vanishes before a man takes one step of his journey: but when the *Spirit* teaches by the *Word*, the Spirit makes the Word *a light to a Believer's feet, and a lamp to his paths*; that is, it becomes a practical light, and hereby 'tis also known to be effectual.

Rom. 1.

Psal. 119. 105.

2. *He feels a divine power prevailing upon his will.*

2. A true Believer feels a divine *power* prevailing upon his will, which he proves to be *supernatural* both by the exceeding greatness of it in its *principle*, and also by the mighty working of it in *its effects*: The Apostle *Paul* desires of God that the *Ephesians* might *know* that they were effectually called, and that they might also know the hope thereof, in *Ephes.* 1. 18. And in Verse 19. he declares *how* this might be *obtained*, namely, 1. by discerning *the exceeding greatness of God's power towards them that believe*, (that is in its principle:) 2. by discerning the working of this mighty power *in them* that believe; that is, in the effects thereof. God's power exercised upon, and towards Believers, is said here in its self to be *great*; nay more, 'tis *greatness*; farther yet, 'tis *greatness of power*; higher yet, 'tis *exceeding greatness of power*: Can this power be put forth upon man, and man be wholly insensible thereof? 'tis impossible; especially if you add the other consideration of the effects that are wrought by this power in Believers, such as these, the quickning of life-less *Sinners*, *and the raising of them from the dead*; *the renewing of the spirit of the mind*; *the putting on the new man*, *which is created after the image of God in Christ Jesus*, *in righteousness and true holiness*: these signal effects which a Believer cannot but feel, do as certainly prove an effectual call, as the work of the old Creation do prove the existence of a *God*; or the *Miracles* wrought by *Christ*, did prove him to be the *Son of God*.

Τί τὸ ὑπερβάλλον μέγεθος τῆ δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ εἰς ἡμᾶς τοὺς πιστεύοντας, κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους τῆ ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ. Ephes. 1. 19.

Cap. 2. v. 1.

Cap 4. v. 23, 24

3. *He hath a spiritual taste of the goodness of God, and his ways.*

3. A true Believer hath a spiritual *taste* of God's love and favour, and of the *goodness* of his ways, and by it he is able to prove that *he is born of God*, according to that of the Apostle, 1 *Pet.* 2. 1. But *Bellarmine* here doth object, That *Hypocrites* and *Apostates* are supposed in *Heb.* 6. to have a *taste* of the good Word of God. I answer, 1. An Hypocrite may have a taste of the Word, but 'tis *but a taste*; whereas a true Believer drinks so deep of these waters of life, that *they become a well of living water springing up to everlasting life.* 2. Although a Hypocrite may have some taste of the sweetness of the *Word*; yet he always *tastes* a *greater* sweetness in the *World*: but 'tis contrary in *Believers*; *David* tasted the Word to be *sweeter* than *Honey*, and *more* precious than much fine *Gold.* The stony ground *received* indeed *the Word*

Bellarmine's *Objection from* Heb. 6. 4, 5. *answered.*

Joh. 4. 14.

Psal. 19. 10.

Mat. 13. 20, 21.

with

with joy at first, but parted with it *again*, rather than undergo the *sorrow* of persecution. 3. An Hypocrite may taste some sweetness in the *promises* and *priviledges* of the Word, and the *gifts* of the Spirit, but not in the *precepts* of the Word, or *graces* of the Spirit: *Simon Magus* would part with the *World*, and give *Money* for the *miraculous power* of the Spirit; but he regarded not the *sanctity* of the Spirit, or *obedience* to its Laws; but a Believer thinks *that in the very keeping of God's Commands there is great reward*; *and* David *professes his delight to do the will of God*: so that by these, and many other *acts* of sense, (which I must not name) a Believer is able to *prove* that he is *effectually called*, and and that *certainly*, and without *errour* or *mistake*: For the Rule holds good in the due exercise of *spiritual* as well as *bodily* sense, That *Sensus non fallitur circa proprium objectum*; *Sense cannot be deceived about its proper object*: bodily sense is so certain, as that Christ himself appeals to it; in a proper case, Reason discerns that Spirits have neither flesh or bones, and Christ bids his Disciples to exercise their *sense*, and to *feel* that he had both. From the certainty of outward sense, we do *most* justly reject the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*: The Receiver *sees* bread, *feels* bread, *smells* bread, *tastes* bread, and yet the *senseless* Priest would have men believe that 'tis flesh. But a *Papist* will tell you, that there may be *disceptio visus*, a mistake in sight and sense, both *external* and *internal*. I answer, The evidence of sense in *general* is certain and unerring, (although there may be some mistake in *particular* acts of sense) upon two accounts: First, Because the causes of *particular* errours may always be known to be, 1. either the ill disposition of the Organ, as in a Jaundice-eye; or, 2. the distance of the object, as the apparent smallness of heavenly bodies; or, 3. the different *medium* through which the object is beheld, as a staff half in water and half out seems crooked. Secondly, Because by much experience, observation and guidance of reason, men have been able to form and establish certain Rules whereby to rectifie all these mistakes. In like manner (by the Guidance of the Spirit) God hath given in his *Word* most *certain* Rules whereby men may *know* from whence the *mistakes* of *internal* sense do arise, and in what manner, and by what means they may be corrected. From all which I may safely conclude, that *as* there are certain Sciences built upon the certainty of bodily sense, (as Opticks, and many other Mathematical Sciences) notwithstanding particular mistakes in some acts: so 'tis possible by experience and observation, together with the *Guidance* of the *Word* and *Spirit*, for a Believer to prove, that his spiritual sense doth not err, and consequently that he is effectually called.

Act. 8. 18, 19.

Psal. 19. 11.

Sense is a certain and unerring evidence, Luk. 24 39. *The Papists are of the opinion of* Heraclitus, Κακὸι μάρτυρες, ἀνθρώπων ὀφθαλμοί, *No man must believe his eyes. Like as the Philistins dealt with* Samson, *they would put out our eyes, that we might grind in their Mill, or bring grist to it: Like the Pharisees*, Joh. 9. 25. *that would perswade the man born blind, that he was so still, because they were unwilling to own Christ, the Author of his sight.*

2 Pet. 1. 19.

3. By infallible testimony of the the Spirit.

In the last place, I say, 'tis possible for a Believer to prove that he is effectually called, by infallible testimony of the Spirit: this sort of evidence, by *Authority* or *Witness*, Logicians call *Argumentum artificiale*, an artificial Argument; but in our case 'tis *Argumentum certissimum*, a most certain proof: for if God hath said, *That in the mouth of two or three* humane *Witnesses every word is established*, that is, *made sure*; how much more sure is the evidence that is given in by the Spirit of God, who cannot lye?

Deut. 17. 6.

Heb. 6. 18.

This testimony either written, 2 Tim. 3. 16. *or real: the real testimony is either,* 1. *Material, mediate and objective.*

Now the testimony of the Spirit of God, is either *written* in the *Word*, or *real* in its *Works*: How far the written testimony of the Spirit in Scripture (which is Θεόπνευστος) is a foundation of assurance, I have already declared: The *real* testimony of the Spirit is two-fold: 1. *Material*, *mediate*, and only *objective*, *viz.* When the Spirit of God by the work of sanctification wrought in a Believer, doth thereby afford to a Believer objectively (and mediately by the fruits of the Spirit) matter of proof or evidence, whereby he may evince by argument, that he is effectually called. This sort of evidence I have also already spoken to; therefore 'tis yet another kind of testimony of the Spirit that I would here more especially insist upon; namely, the *efficient*, *immediate*, and *formal testimony* of the Spirit of God. Several Divines call it by several names, but they all understand *one* and the same thing, that there is a witnessing work of the Spirit, distinct from the *regenerating* work, and from the sanctifying work thereof, is evident by that plain Text of the Apostle to the *Romans*, where he saith, *That the Spirit it self beareth witness with our spirits, that we are the children of God*: Where observe, 1. The *testes*; 2. The *testimonium*; 3. The *modus testificandi*.

2. Formal, immediate and efficient.

Rom. 8. 16.

Three things considerable in these words.

1. The witnesses.

First, observe the Witnesses; these are two: 1. The Spirit of God: 2. Our own spirit: These are two *distinct* Witnesses, and we ought always to consider them as truly and properly distinct: For as the Spirit of God is really and personally distinguished from our spirits; so the act of the Spirit in witnessing is as truly distinct from the act of our own spirits. A Believers own spirit doth sometimes prove, and may witness actually and truly its effectual call; and yet the Spirit of God may at that time suspend its immediate testimony, *pro hic, & nunc.* Now all those things which can be really separated, are to be considered as distinct, even then when they are *conjoined*; and that the testimony of the Spirit of God is distinct from the testimony of our spirits, is evident from the words themselves, being duly considered: for the Apostle saith, That *the Spirit it self* witnesseth *with our spirits*; but of this more, after we have considered,

Not τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα, but αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα.

2. The testimony or thing witnessed.

2. The testimony, or the thing witnessed; which is this, That we are the sons of God; which phrase comprehends, 1. A Believers *Regeneration*. 2. His *relation*, of an adopted son of God. 3. His partaking of the *divine nature*, or being conformed to the Image of Christ. 4. His

obtaining

obtaining of a *right of co-inheritance* with Christ. Now *Regeneration*, and an *effectual call*, (I have shewn) are one and the same thing: the matter of this testimony therefore, witnessed both by our spirits, and also by the Spirit of God, is this, That we are effectually called.

3. The manner of witnessing is expressed by the word Συμμαρτυρεῖ; the Spirit doth co-witness, which cannot be meant (as some would have it) *only* of the Spirit's using the faculties of *our mind instrumentally*, (as a Scribe useth a Pen as his Instrument to attest any Writing.) 'Tis true, that the Spirit of God doth bear witness with our spirits, that is, *by* our spirits, *in as much as* our *own* faculties are *employed* in *receiving* and *discerning* the testimony of God's Spirit; but *yet* we must be careful that we do not *confound* the *acts* of God's Spirit with the *acts* of our own *faculties* in this testimony: for so we should also confound the distinction of the *Witnesses* themselves; and we should hardly escape confounding the distinction that is between the Spirit's *objective* or *material* testimony, and its efficient and *formal* testimony. For avoiding of which, and for opening of the manner of the Spirit's *immediate* witnessing, I desire that these things may be considered.

3. *The manner of witnessing.*

Opened in three parts.

1. That the Spirit of God when it is said to witness with our spirits, is not to be supposed to give its testimony by any *external voice* or *words*, but it gives even its immediate testimony by some *work* or *operation* upon the mind of man. That all sorts of spirits can express themselves to spirits *without words*, is manifest in the acknowledged converse or communion that is between Angels amongst themselves, good Angels with good, and bad with bad; as also by the suggestions of *good* Angels and *bad* Angels upon the minds of *men*; as also by that which the Scripture saith of mental or *unexpressed* unuttered prayer, in *Rom.* 8. 26. and by the instance of *Hannah*. If *created spirits* can express themselves to spirits *without words*, much more may the *Eternal Spirit* reveal himself to the mind of man *how* or *as* he pleases. He that *created* the faculties of man's mind, *can put them* into *act* and *exercise* by what ways or means soever he pleases: He that knows our thoughts *before we think them*, can cause us to *think* or *know* whatever he pleases to impress upon them.

1. *'Tis by some operation, not voice; spirits speak the language of spirits, and of their own region.*

Some Philosophers have undertaken to shew the way whereby the Angels and Spirits do converse, 1 Sam. 1. 13. Ezek. 38. 10.

2. As all the *Revelations* of God's Spirit are *harmonious*, and *consonant* one with another, so are all the *Works* of God's Spirit always *agreeable* and *concording*, so as *one* work thereof destroys not *another* work of the same Spirit; and thence it is, that God having endued men with *faculties* of *judging* and *discerning* of truth by its proper evidences, doth never cause the soul of man to *believe* any truth, but he gives them a *ground* or *reason* of its belief. I do not say that he gives always a reason of the thing, but he gives a reason of our belief: the *supernatural* works of the Spirit, do not *destroy*, but *restore* and *perfect Nature*. Now the *natural* way of conviction of man's mind being by evidencing the *reason* of things; hence, when the Spirit convinces man of

2. *'Tis by rational convictions.*

of any thing, he doth (as it were) by Argument. The Spirit of God convinces men of *righteousness*, and of *pardon* of sin, in the same manner that it convinces of sin, and its guilt, which is by way of Argument, as the word ἐλέγχει doth signifie, in *Joh.* 16. 8. Hence Faith also (which is wrought by the Spirit) is said to be ἔλεγχος ὑ πραγμάτων, the Argumentative *evidence of things not seen.* I hope no man is so weak as think that the Spirit convinces by *verbal expression* of the terms of *three* Propositions of an Argument; but yet it doth something equivalent thereunto. For,

Heb. 11. 1.

3. *'Tis by special Illumination.*

3. The *proper* work of the Spirit in *giving this testimony*, is to *illuminate the mind of man*, both in a *greater degree*, and *to another end* than it did *illuminate* it in its *first* work of *Conversion:* In *Conversion*, the objects revealed are *those*, that, being once *discovered*, do engage the soul to put forth the *direct* act of faith; but in this witnessing work, the Spirit reveals *those* objects that by their discovery do *enable* the soul to exercise the *reflex* act of faith; and *withal* the Spirit doth *immediately assist* the mind of man in its act of *reflexion* upon the work of sanctification formerly wrought by the Spirit.

You may understand *both* the *nature* and *distinction* of the Spirit's testimony, how it is *different* from the testimony of our own spirits, by this *similitude:* Suppose a *purblind person*, reading a *small* print by the light of a *farthing* Candle, by which he *knows*, and is able to *testifie truly* what is written in that Book which he so reads; yet when he considers *how apt* he may be *in those circumstances* to mistake, he still doubts *comparatively* to what he knows: when a *skilful Oculist* hath repaired his *sight*, and hath by Glasses magnified the *Characters* of the Book, and hath let into the room *the beams of the Sun*, which were before withheld. Thus the work of the Spirit is to assist our *faculties*, and strengthen them; to irradiate and illustrate its *own work* of sanctification, and also to bring in *a fuller light* from the Word, making it speak more *clear* and full: by all which the Spirit of God may be said to give a different and distinct testimony from that which our *unassisted* faculties, or *gradually unenlightened* minds could give of themselves.

Quest. 1. *Why is this called a co-witness?*

1. If it be asked, Why this act of the Spirit of God is called a *co-witnessing* with our spirits? I answer, First, because the Spirit *adds* its special assistance *to our* spirits, in all and every exercise of *our faculties*, about their giving in their testimony. In particular, 1. It irradiates the mind; and, 2. It more *emphatically* reveals to the soul the truth of the *promise*, that every one that believes shall be saved; 3. It more *fully* makes known its own work, and shews to the soul by *good evidences* that it doth believe; 4. It assists the reason of man more *convincingly* to draw the conclusion, that therefore it shall be saved: And in this manner the Spirit witnesses to every Proposition of the assuring Argument. Secondly, and more especially, the Spirit is said to witness *with* our spirits, because the *matter witnessed* by the Spirit of *God*, is the same which

is

is witnessed by our *own* spirits; and this properly speaks it to be a co-witness; for it witnesses not only in the same manner, but it also witnesseth the same matter which our spirits do witness.

2. If it be demanded, How a Believer may be assured that the Spirit doth certainly witness with our spirits? I answer, he may be assured by two things: 1. By that *special distinguishing light* that accompanies the testimony of the Spirit, which doth *manifest* it self *so* as to *over-bear* all *doubts* and *disputes* both about our *spiritual* estate, and about this *testimony* it self: just as the *light of the Sun* doth not only *discover other things*, and *reveal* them; but doth manifest it *self* by its *self-evidencing property*, which is *able* to *convince* every beholder. 2. By the *harmony* and *agreement* that is between the testimony of the Spirit of God, and *our* spirits; just as we know the testimony of our spirits to be certain and true by its agreement with the Word; except all these *three* agree in one, there can be no full certainty: but a Believers assurance is always confirmed by the *concurring testimony* of these three: 1. Of the Word, 2. Of Conscience, and 3. Of the Spirit, all witnessing *one* and the *same* thing. 1. The *sure Word* of God lays down certain signs and marks of true Grace, and witnesses these signs to be good evidences. 2. Then *Conscience*, or our *own spirit* witnesses that these signs are found in a Believer. 3. Then God super-adds the witness of his own Spirit, which enables us yet *more fully* to know the things which are freely given us of God: And now what doubts can remain? 'Tis true, we are bid to try every spirit, and we have a *way* to try them *by*, *viz.* the *agreement* of *their* testimony with the testimony of *Scripture* and *Conscience:* although there may be such things as παρήλια, or Mock-Suns, and sometimes the Glory of the true Sun (which yet is a prodigiously rare instance) is not able to distinguish it self from its *Apes*; yet in this very case (by the Rules of Calculation) an Astronomer is able to distinguish the *true* Sun from the *false*, so that the Science of *Astronomy* is never a whit *the less* certain: 'Tis so as to the Spirit's testimony; 'tis certain that by the Word and Conscience a Believer may *infallibly* prove the testimony of the Spirit to be *true*, and not false, because there is and must be an universal agreement between all these three.

Quest. 2. *How is a Believer certain that the Spirit doth witness?*

Ὅταν τὸ πνεῦμα μαρτυρῇ παισὶν ἀμφιβολίας. Chrysost. in Rom 8.

Our Adversaries have (*many* of them) endeavoured to *enervate* the single testimony of *Scripture*, because of the *mysteriousness* of Scripture, as they call it. *Others* seek to debilitate the testimony of *Conscience*, because men are apt to be *partial*. Others would weaken the testimony of the *Spirit*, because 'tis apt to be *mistaken*. But should we grant that none of those three Witnesses were *separately* sufficient, yet when they are *conjoined*, from thence there doth arise an *undoubted* assurance. Although the *strength* of one *Pillar*, or the soundness of the *Foundation* alone not prove a House to be well built; yet the strength of *all* the Pillars, and of the Foundation considered together, do fully prove it to be strong. What if one single Souldier be not sufficient to secure a Fort?

yet

yet may not many Souldiers do it? How much then do our Adversaries trifle, while they seek to engage one single Combatant as no good Witness of assurance? but they dare not look our Army in the face:
Heb. 12. 1. Behold, we are compassed about with a Cloud of Witnesses; let them dispel this Cloud if they can. Although no man can be made sure of the time of the day by a Dial that hath no *Figures* upon it; and although a *blind man* cannot know the hour when there *are* Figures upon the Dial; and although one that hath *good eyes*, and seeth the Figures, yet cannot know the time if the *Sun shines not:* yet from hence it doth not follow, but that if there be a *concurrence* of *Lines* and *Figures*, of *Sight* and *Sun-shine together*, and the Dial be made, and placed by *infallible* Rules of *Art*, it will then certainly evidence the time of the day. In like manner the *Graces* of God's Spirit imprinted on the heart, the *eye* of Conscience open in examination and observation, and the *light* of the Spirit as the Sun-shine, these three *concurring together*, and all of them *agreeing* with the *Word*, which is the standing *Rule* of judgment, by which *all* the other are *regulated* and *ordered*; I say, from hence ariseth a *demonstrative*, *undoubted*, and *infallible* certainty; and this *concurrence* being *possible*, 'tis therefore *possible* for a Believer to attain to an assured knowledge that he is effectually called.

2. Special Proposition, That 'tis possible for one that is assured of his calling, to be thereby also assured of his eternal election; proved from the nature of election, and the dependance effectual calling hath thereon.

I proceed to the proof of the second special Proposition, That 'tis *possible for a Believer who is sure of his effectual vocation in time, to be assured also of his election in eternity.* I shall need to be but *brief* in the *proof* of this, having *already in part proved* that there is such a thing as *special* and *discriminating* Grace, whereby *one* call of God proves *effectual*, another *not.* Now our Adversaries themselves *grant*, that if God doth exercise a *discriminating* Grace in special *effectual vocation*, 'tis necessary that he should eternally *decree* to exercise that *special Grace* upon those persons from eternity. The proof of *this* Proposition will *depend* upon these *two* Arguments.

Arg. 1. An effectual call depends upon eternal election, as upon its necessary principal cause.

If an effectual call doth *depend* upon God's eternal election, as upon its *necessary* cause, then *he* that knows that he is effectually *called*, may know *he* was eternally *elected*; (no man of reason will deny this *Consequence*, and therefore I need not prove it.) But an effectuall call doth *depend* upon God's eternal *election*, as upon its *necessary* cause; and therefore he that knows the *one*, may also know the *other:* this I shall *prove* from some plain and expres Texts of Scripture; see *Ephes.* 1. in the beginning of which Chapter you have the *nature* of election opened in all its *causes* and *properties*, (which I must not *particularly* name) in *brief*, you may observe that according to the Apostle's *description* thereof, *election is that decree of God, whereby out of the meer good pleasure of his own will, he did eternally chuse some certain individual persons out of the corrupt mass of mankind, unto the infallible attainment of Grace here, and Glory hereafter.* Now if this be the nature of election, *viz.* that Grace (or an effectual call) was thereby eternally *decreed* to be *conferred*

and

and bestowed; it will then necessarily follow, that Grace, or an effectual call, *doth depend* upon election as *its cause:* which is plainly expressed, Vers. 4. where *Holiness* and *blamelessness* (which are insuperable properties of an effectual call) are said to be the effects *of God's election and choice.* 'Tis a very good note of *Thomas Aquinas*, who observes that *love* and *choice* in *God* doth very much *differ* from love and choice in *men:* for love in *men* (saith he) doth not *cause loveliness* in the *beloved*, but *men* first discern a *loveliness*, and this causes a *love* and *choice*; whereas God first exercised a *free love* in his eternal election, predestinating the way and means of farther *manifestation* of his love, and then in time he *effects* his own *purpose*, making the objects of his *love* to become *lovely*, by his renewing his own image upon them in an effectual call. Agreeable hereunto is that expression of the Council of *Orange*, *God loved us not as we are by our desert, but as he designed to make us by his gift.* He that would rightly understand the relation vocation in time, hath unto election in eternity, and he that would know the dependance which *that effect* hath upon *this cause*, must first consider, that although all the decrees of God are in themselves but *one* simple act of God's will; yet as to humane *apprehension* many men have *conceived* that there are *three distinct acts* of the Divine Will comprehended in his *decree of election.* 1. Ἐκλογὴ, a *choice*, or a *separating* and singling out of some individual persons to be the objects of his love. 2. Πρόθεσις, a *purpose*, or an intention and design of bestowing saving Grace in effectual calling of those chosen ones. 3. Προορισμὸς, a *Predestination*, or a pre-determination of bringing those called and gracious persons unto Glory. I shall not here meddle with the *Controversie* which is agitated about the *priority* or *precedency* of these *two* last acts of the Divine Will; only you must consider, that as the *decree* of God, whereby he purposed to bestow both *Grace* and *Glory*, was truly in it self but *one* eternal act of his Will, (and so there could be no priority of time amongst them) so we ought not *in our Conceptions* to distinguish between *Glory* and *Grace*, as if *one* were designed as the *end*, and the *other* as the *means*, (which is too common a mistake:) for *in truth*, Grace and Glory differ only as *lesser* and *greater* measures of the same thing; and therefore we say, that *God's absolute* and inconditionate purpose effectually to call some persons, and to give them Grace, passing by others, doth declare the *whole nature of God's decree of election*, in as much as the *selection* of the objects of God's love, and also the *nature* both of the *act* and *end* of his love, are all comprehended in that *one purpose* of effectual calling, which the *Salmurien Divines* do shew more fully in their explication of *election:* all which being duly considered, do abundantly manifest that *vocation* in time, was a most assured effect of *election* in eternity, according to that of *Rom.* 8. 23. where almost in express words *our calling* is said to be the effect of *God's purpose*; and agreeable also is that of 2 *Thess.* 2. 13, 14. where *sanctification* and *faith*

T. A. Sum. 1. par. Q. 23.

Tales nos amat Deus, Quales Futuri sumus, ipsius dono non quales sumus nostro merito Conc. 2. Canon. 2.

Grace is Glory begun, Glory is Grace perfected, Preston New Cov.

Thes. Salm. de elect. Lib. 1. sec. 29. 30.

wrought in an *effectual call*, is declared to be the fruit of being *chosen from the beginning: We are bound to give thanks* alway *to God for you, Brethren, beloved of the Lord, because God hath chosen you from the beginning to salvation, through sanctification and belief of the truth whereunto he called you by our Gospel, to the obtaining of the glory of the Lord Jesus Christ.* Observe here, first, that God hath designed to bestow Grace and Glory on some men: Secondly, that God actually accomplisheth his design by effectual calling of these persons; *i.e.* by working of faith, or a belief of the truth, and of sanctification in them: Thirdly, that the original and primitive ground or cause of an effectual call, is God's eternal election and choice of them. Therefore doth the Spirit bring the Elect into the state of Sons, because God hath predestinated them to the adoption of Sons. The Spirit is the immediate cause of Regeneration; but that the Spirit works otherwise in one person than it doth in another, is the effect of eternal election: And there is always so certain a dependance which an effectual call hath upon election, as that they are sometimes put for one and the same thing, *Rom.* 9. 11.

2 *Arg. Vocation depends upon election as its rule or measure.*

Secondly, We prove that all those that know they are effectually called, may know that they were eternally elected, because effectual calling depends upon God's eternal election as its *rule* or *measure*; that is, effectual calling (as to the persons called) is *commensurate* with the *objective matter* of God's eternal election: my meaning is this, that *all* those, and *only* those persons that were eternally *elected*, shall be effectually *called*; and *therefore* whoever *knows* that he is effectually called, may *know* he was eternally elected. The very *essence* of an effectual call consists, as I have shewn, in the Spirit's working of *saving faith* in *those* whom it doth call; but the *Spirit* works saving faith in *all* the elect, and *only* in them, this is plainly manifest in *Acts* 13. 48. *As many as were ordained to eternal life believed*; so many, and no more, as were *ordained*, or fore-determined: if the word be translated *fore-disposed*, (as some would have it) it must be meant of *God's* disposing, not of *man's* disposing himself. Some men talk much of a *tempus congruum*, a fit season for Conversion; but the Decree of God depends not upon our *predisposition*, but upon God's election, as appears in the instance of Saint *Paul*, who being a chosen vessel, was converted when he was in the *heighth* of his persecution. The *working* of faith depends so much upon God's election, as that *saving faith* bears the name of *the faith of God's elect*, Tit. 1. 1. it being proper only to them. Moreover, it appears that *only* those that are *elected* shall be *effectually* called, because only the elect shall be saved: it is expresly said, That all *those whose names are not written in the book of life, shall be cast into the lake that burns with fire and brimstone*, Rev. 20. ult. It was the custom of old to write down the names of persons designed to places of *Honour* in *Books* or *Registers*; hence the Spirit of God compares God's election of persons

Καὶ ὅσοι ἦσαν τεταγμένοι εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

Σκεῦος ἐκλογῆς, *a vessel of election*, Act. 9. 15

Roman Senators called Patres conscripti

sons to *Grace* and Glory, to that *known custom:* in allusion unto which also St. *Paul* saith that the names of *Euodius*, and *Syntiche*, and *Clement*, were written *in the book of life*; and Christ bids his Disciples *rejoice that their names were written in Heaven*; *i.e.* that they were elect: on the contrary, the non-elect are said *not to have their names written in the Lamb's book of life*, in Rev. 13. 8. and Rev. 17. 8. and the doom of all such is to be cast into the lake of fire, for these shall never be called effectually here, or saved eternally hereafter. Phil 4. 3. Luk. 10. 20.

I know *Socinus* and *Crellius*, and some others, by the *book* of life, do understand the *Scripture*, wherein God hath declared that all *penitent* believers shall be saved, and all *impenitent* and unbelievers shall be damned; and consequently (say they) all believers have their names written there; but unbelievers have not their names written, in as much as they come not under the Qualifications written in the Word. But to this I answer: 1. That by the Book of life must be meant God's *eternal* decree, not any declaration made by him *in time:* for the non-elect are described, *Jude* 4. to be men, *πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα*, *of old ordained*, or eternally decreed, *to this condemnation*, as Bishop *Dav.* observes: and on the other hand, the elect are said *to be saved, and called with an holy calling, not according to works, but according to his purpose and grace which was given in Christ Jesus before the world began.* 2. Again, in the Book of Life, there was an absolute election of *persons recorded*, and not a conditional Declaration of *qualities declared:* for by names (in all the fore-quoted places) are understood persons, as appears by many other Texts of Scripture, as *Numb.* 1. 2. by *taking the number of names*, is meant the number of persons, *every male by pole:* So *Act.* 1. 15. the number of *names*, that is, *persons*, *were about an hundred and twenty:* and *Sardis* had *a few names*, that is, *a few persons that were upright*, Rev. 3. 4. In vain therefore do either Papists or Socinians seek to divide those things that God hath conjoined, *viz.* eternal election, and effectual vocation; which have that relation one to another, as that he that knows one, knows both: for if vocation depends on election as its necessary cause, and as its adequate rule and measure, I hope I shall not need to prove the consequence, since all men grant that those things that are commensurate, and of equal extent, do necessarily make each other known. Epiſcop. Vorſtius, &c. Καὶ ἰδίαν προθεσιν καὶ χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσαν πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων, 2 Tim. 1. 9. Numerus electorum est Deo certus; non solum, ut cognitus, sed ut electus & prædefinitus. *See* T. Aq. par. 1. q. 23. a. 7. *The elect, a determinate number as elect,* 7000 *which had not bowed to Baal,* 1 King. 19. 18. 144000 *sealed,* Rev. 7. 4.

He therefore that would make his election sure, may do it by making his calling sure; and that is the order he must proceed in: for although God at first *chuses*, and then *calls*; yet we must *first* know our calling, and *then* our election: God *descends* from *love* to *choice*, from *chusing* to *calling*, or to *infusing* of the principles of saving Grace, then to *sanctifying*, or adding of *greater measure* of Grace; but in the trial of our state, and in our *evidencing* of our *interest* in God's love, we must *ascend* from *sanctification* to *vocation*, and from *vocation* to *election:* Election is as the *Spring-head* of all consequent acts of Divine love; he Rom. 8 29.

that would find the *fountain*, must begin at the *stream*, and so trace it upward to its first *sourse*: Election is (as the *root* or *seed*) *hidden*, *and unknown* in it self; he that would *know* the nature of a Tree, let him not uncover the *root*, but let him observe the *fruits*, for by them it may best be known. Weak eyes may better behold the *beams* of the light reflected, than by looking on the *body* of the Sun, which many having *presumed* to do, have *lost* their sight wholly: and so it comes to pass, when men search *directly* into the decree of *election*, without considering that it is better and more easily *manifested* by an effectual call. It is not lawful for any man to look into this *Ark*, or to attempt to read the Law of God's eternal purposes, as they are there locked up in his decrees; 'tis sufficient that we may see the transcript of them written on our own heart: *Secret things belong to God, but revealed things to us and our Children.* No man must enter into the *Council Chamber*, that he may know the will of his *Prince*; but must wait for its discovery in the *published Proclamation. Mordecai* understood little of the King's love to him, when *Ahasuerus* consulted *what should be done to the person whom the King delighted to honour*; but he well knew that he was a favourite when he saw himself *cloathed in Royal Robes, and beheld the King's Signet upon his hand:* so when a Believer finds himself *cloathed* with the *white linen of the Saints*, and hath once received *the Seal of God's Spirit*, he may safely conclude that God from eternity decreed to honour him here, and glorifie him hereafter.

Inter Gratiam & præestinationem hoc tantum interest, quod prædestinatio est gratiæ præparatio; Gratia vero est ipsa donatio, Aug. de præd. cap. 10.

Deut. 24. 24.

Esther 6. 10.

Rev. 19. 8, 14. 2 Cor. 1. 22.

Let me therefore for a close of this second Proposition, give all *Believers* the same counsel that *Elihu* gave to *Job*, and *Job*'s friends, *Desire not the night, (i. e.* pry not into the dark secrets of God's decrees) *but remember thou magnifie God's works which thy eyes do behold*; *i. e.* the fruits and consequences of those decrees appearing in an effectual call: 'Tis boldness to break ope the Seal of a Decree, till thou hast read thy *Name* wrote in the *Superscription*; Election is *Love under a Seal of secresie*, but an effectual call *opens* this most *fully*, and evidently makes known the purpose of God from eternity.

Job 36. 20.

Third special Proposition.

The third special Proposition, which remains to be proved, is this, *That all true Believers that do assuredly know they are called, and were elected, may also know they shall persevere unto glory.* Many have been the Disputes concerning the possibility of a Believers falling from *Grace*; but most of the *Arguments* that are used with design to prove the *possibility* thereof, will *fall* to the ground if the *Question* be rightly stated. To which purpose I shall in the *first place* lay down some premises, and which may *obviate* the Arguments and Objections of our Adversaries; and then give you *our* Arguments to *prove* the Proposition. When we say then that some Believers may assuredly know that they shall persevere, and that they shall not fall from Grace, we do premise, that,

First,

First, We do distinguish between Grace actively taken for God's favour to us, (*Gratia gratis dans*, as the Schools call it) and (*Gratia gratis data*) Grace passively taken, Grace wrought in us, (which is the effect of the former:) for it is not from the nature of Grace *passively* taken, or from Grace inherent in Believers, that they do *persevere*, and not *fall* away; but it is from the nature of that Grace (actively taken) that dwells in God's bosom; this is the ground that Believers persevere to Glory, as 'tis clearly expressed by Christ himself, *Joh.* 13. 1. *He having loved his own which were in the world, he loved them to the end.*

1 *Premise* Χάρις & χάρισμα, differunt sicut causa & effectus vel ut lux in Sole & Lumen in aere, Bradward. de causa Dei, lib. 2. cap. 13.

Concerning this *active* Grace of God, we do distinguish between the *exercise of it*, and the *manifestation* of that exercise: We deny not but God may seem to be angry; but yet we say he never casts off his people, or forgets to be gracious. The Sun may be muffled for a time in a Cloud, yet some heat will be communicated during the time it is hid, and in due time the beams of light will break through, and disperse the Cloud also. Christ may stand behind the Wall, yet *then he will shew himself through the Lattice*, and in time the Wall of Separation also shall be broken down. God may correct his Children, but will not disinherit them.

2 *Premise.*

Nebuchadnezzar *lost possession of not right to his Crown.* Cant. 2. 9.

Concerning Grace in *us*, (passively taken) we do distinguish between *acts* and *habits* of Grace. No man did ever say, that a truly regenerate person cannot omit the performance of some *acts* of Grace which *formerly* he performed, and is *still* bound to perform: but this we say, that the *habits* of Grace are never lost, or wholly eradicated; and we say that those acts of Grace which were interrupted, do abide in their principle, and will again exert themselves when opportunity is afforded: 'tis one thing to fall *in* the way, another thing to deviate *from* the way: 'tis *one* thing, *semel recedere a pietatis tramite*, to take a step awry from the path of holiness, *another* thing, *semper discedere a pietatis via*, to forsake the ways of God wholly; a Believer may be guilty of the first, not the second.

3 *Premise.*

Actio pervertitur fides non evertitur, Bernard. de Gratia, & lib.

Again, we distinguish between a *shew* of Grace, and *true* Grace: there are several instances in the Word of God of persons falling from a *shew* of Grace, *Demas*, *Judas*, *Saul*, *Hymeneus*, fell from *hypocrisie* into open *prophaneness* and *impiety*: but no sincere person ever fell from true Grace. *Paint* may be soon washt off, when a *healthful*, beautiful complexion will abide: a *Bristol-stone* is soon *broken*, but a true *Diamond* will abide the smartest stroke. Many Professors have suffered *shipwrack as to faith*, and others have lost their first love; but 'tis such faith as had no root, like that of the stony-ground, and such love as had no *principle*, 'twas only a passion and transport, and such *hot* love may be soon *cold*. *Common fire* is soon *extinct*, but the *fire* of the *Sanctuary* never went out.

4 *Premise.*

Charitas quæ deperditur nunquam fuit vera Charitas, Ansel. de Concor. præscien. & prædest. 1 Tim. 1. 19. Rev. 2. 3. Mat. 13. 18.

As

5 *Premiss.* As for those Texts that *Bellarmine* urges, that the *Just do fall seven times a day*, Prov. 24. 16. and that in *many things we offend all*, Jam. 3. 2. the very words themselves carry a full answer to his Objections: for if the just *fall* seven times a day, 'tis supposed he *rises* as often; and if in many things we *offend* all, then 'tis in some but an *offence* or a stumble, not a final falling: there is difference between foils and falls, and there is difference between falling *into sin*, and lying *in sin*; there is difference between *recession* from Grace, and *excision* of Grace; the *first* is possible to happen for a time to a Believer, but God will never suffer the second to come upon him: for although a Believer may fall, yet he falls only as *Cork* falls into the water, which may for a time be immersed, but it will rise again, and get aloft; but an Hypocrite falls as *Lead* into the water, which sinks and rises no more. Having premised these things, I proceed to the Arguments, which evince the perseverance of all that are effectually called unto Glory.

Vide Aug. de cor. & Grat. cap. 9.

1 *Arg. From the immutability of God's Decree.* First Argument is from the *immutability* and *unchangeableness* of God's *Purposes* and *Decrees*. I have already proved that God did from before the foundation of the World decree to make some particular persons the objects of his love, and that these persons were *fore-ordained* of God to be effectually called in *time*, and to be glorified in *eternity*: Now *the gifts and calling of God are* (saith the Apostle) *without repentance*, ἀμεταμέλητα, such as God *never can* or *will* repent of. There is a necessary *connexion* between every *Decree* of God, and its full *execution* and performance: all the *powers* of *Hell* are not able to *break* by *force*, nor all the *subtilty* of the *Jesuites* of *Rome* able to dissolve or untie by *skill*, that strong and necessary connexion of all those *links* of that *Golden Chain* that is drawn forth in that fore-quoted *Rom.* 8. 29, 30. Foreknowledge, or Election, Vocation, Justification and Glorification, are *inseparably* conjoined; so that whoever hath hold of *one* of them, hath hold of all; and he that *knoweth one*, *knoweth all*. The Apostle in *Rom.* 9. 11. doth fully assert that God did exercise Sovereign discriminating Grace in his eternal Decree of Election; and withal he declares the immutability and unchangeableness of that Decree: mark his words: *The Children* (saith he) *not being yet born, neither having done good or evil, that the purpose of God might stand, not of him that works, but of him that calleth, it is said, The elder shall serve the younger*, &c. God's purpose must stand, μενῇ, must remain steadfast, as *Beza*, or confirmed, as *Castalio* translates it: The Decrees of God are compared to Mountains of Brass, *Zech.* 6. 1. unremoveable, because situate in the eternal Will. Consider the expression used by *Samuel*, 1 Sam. 15. 19. *The Strength of Israel will not lye nor repent, for he is not as man that he should repent.* God is strength it self, and able to preserve all his Decrees made in eternity: the word נֵצַח translated strength, may also be translated eternity or victory; intimating the victorious power that accompanies eternal Decrees. See *Aug. Confess. Lib.* 1. *Cap.* 6. God loves with

Rom. 11. 29.

with an everlasting love, *Jer.* 31. 3. and he works with an invincible power, *Isai.* 14. 27.

Secondly, I argue from that special knowledge that God hath of all those that he hath built savingly upon the right foundation, the Lord Jesus Christ. God is no foolish Builder, to lay the Foundation, and not carry on the Superstructure; and this is the Apostle's own Argument, for the perseverance of Saints, in 2 *Tim.* 2. 19. where the Apostle having observed the Apostacy of some non-elect persons, adds, *Nevertheless the foundation of God stands sure, having this seal, The Lord knoweth who are his.* Amongst many other uses of a Seal, this is one, that it gives ground of *assurance:* Now the Apostle therefore useth that expression of God's *knowing* of his, that from the consideration thereof, Believers might have greater confidence, that they being God's *Husbandry*, and God's *Building*, God will never suffer them to be *removed*, and that because he *knows* them; which phrase signifies these six things.

2 *Arg. God's knowledge of the election a ground of perseverance.*

2 Cor. 3. 12.

1. That God did fore-know them, so the word is used, *Act.* 15. 18. *Known unto God are all his ways from the beginning of the world*; i. e. God did from eternity fore-know and decree whatever should in time come to pass: now this is a *ground* of the Saints *perseverance*, *viz.* That God did fore-know the elect, or decree that all those that he should effectually call, should be *justified*, *sanctified*, and *persevere* unto Glory, as I have already shewn from *Rom.* 8.

For God to know, signifies 1. *To fore-know*, Act. 15. 18.

2. To know, sometime signifies to *own* in a peculiar manner, so *Amos* 3. 2. God speaking to his people *Israel*, saith, That *he knew them above all the families on earth.* God knew *Egypt*, and *Babylon*, and *Moab*, and *Edom*, but he did not know them to be his peculiar people above others; but *so* he did *know* Israel. Thus those that God hath elected, and *effectually* called, God knows them as his *segullah*, his peculiar people, and this is a Seal that they shall persevere.

2 *Peculiarly to own*, Amos 3. 2. סגלה Deut. 26. 24.

3. To know in Scripture, sometimes signifies for God to *approve of*, and to *delight in*, Psal. 1. 6. *The Lord knows the way of the righteous*: God knows the way of *wicked* men, but so as to *curse* it, it shall *perish*; but God *knows* the way of the *elect*, and of those that are effectually called, so as to *approve* of it, and *delight* in it; and this is a Seal, assuring them that they shall not *perish*, but *persevere* in *their way* to Glory.

3. *To approve of, and delight in*, Psal. 1 6.

4. To know, is to *oversee* and take *care of*, as a *Shepherd* knows his *Sheep*, so *Joh.* 10. 27. *My Sheep hear my voice, and I know them*, that is, I take care of them: Christ is such a Shepherd as he himself describes, that *if he hath a hundred Sheep, and one of them go astray, he leaves the ninety and nine, and goes after the lost Sheep till he find it*: And this is also a ground of a true Believers perseverance, that if through *non-attendance*, or *inanimadversion*, or through the violent *persecution* of roaring Lions or Wolves they stray from the Fold, yet Christ reduces them again.

4. *To over see and take care of*, Joh. 10. 27. Luke 15. 4, 5.

5. To

5. To deliver from, or to succour and support in trials, afflictions and temptations, Psal. 57.7. 1 Cor. 10.13.

5. To know, is to deliver *from*, or at least to support and succour *in* afflictions, *trials* and *temptations*, Psal. 37. 7. *I will be glad* (saith David) *and rejoice in thy mercy, for thou hast considered my soul in trouble, and hast known my soul in adversity:* that is, God did both support him *in* affliction, and deliver him from it in his own time. 'Tis an assuring Seal of the perseverance of Believers, that *God will not suffer them to be tempted above what they are able: or else with the temptation will make a way to escape, that they may bear it.*

6. To teach and instruct, to enlighten and inform, Gal. 4. 9.

Lastly, for God to know sometime, is as much as for God to *teach* and *enlighten*; so the Apostle uses the phrase, *Gal.* 4. 9. *How is it, that after you have been known of God, ye turn again to weak and beggerly elements?* The *Galatians* had been *taught* of God, but seducing Teachers would have brought them to join Jewish Ceremonies with Gospel-Worship; now the Apostle wonders at the very thought of such a thing, upon this very account, *viz.* because they were *known* of God, *i.e.* savingly enlightened by him. 'Tis a most *assuring* Seal of perseverance, to have been *rightly enlightened* by the Spirit of God, which is here called, a *being known of him:* so that you now see the Saints perseverance grounded, as in the first place upon God's election, so secondly upon his knowing of Believers in a *special* manner.

Hence it becomes impossible to deceive the elect, Matth. 24. 24.

3 Arg. Perseverance grounded upon the verity of God's Covenant. Jer. 32. 40.

The third Ground of a true Believer's perseverance, is from the nature of *God's Covenant.* Perseverance is one Article of the New Covenant that God hath made with the elect, the terms of which are these: *I will*, saith God, *make an everlasting Covenant with them, I will not turn away from them to do them good, but I will put my fear in their hearts, and they shall not depart away from me.* God hath absolutely engaged that elect Believers shall not depart from him, that is, not finally, because in an effectual call he will put his fear into their hearts; they may wander, but not depart; they may in some acts deviate, but they shall not be backsliders in heart; and the reason is, because though there may be a tendency in them to turn away from God, yet God stands engaged not to turn away from them: hence that expression of God to the Prophet, *They say, if a man put away his wife, and she go from him, shall he return to her again? shall not that Land be greatly polluted? but thou hast played the harlot with many lovers, yet return unto me, saith the Lord.* God will not permit that to be done by *men*, which he may do *himself* in this case; and the reason is, because God can *purge* an adulterous heart, which it is not in the power of man to do: rather than the Marriage-Covenant between Christ and a Believer shall be dissolved, God will put forth his *mighty power*, to *make* and *keep* the hearts of Believers *faithful* and *loyal* to him. What a clear and full promise of perseverance is that also revealed by Christ, in *Joh.* 10. 27. *My sheep hear my voice, I know them, and they follow me; I will give to them eternal life, they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand?* Both the Father and Son stand engaged by promise to preserve elect Believers

The mercies of God's Covenant are both τὰ ὅσια and τὰ πιστὰ, sure and holy, Concessions, so Sept. *translate* Isai. 55. 3. Jer. 31.

God saith concerning his peoples sin, as he said of Israels, I have seen his sins, and I will heal them, Isai. 57. 18. Joh. 10 27.

unto

unto life. Another expres promise of perseverance we find in 1 *Cor.* 1.8,9. *He shall confirm you to the end, that ye may be blameles in the day of our Lord Jesus: God is faithful by whom ye were called unto the fellowship of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord.* *All* those that are *called* have the promise of a most *faithful* God to preserve them *blameles*, even to the *day* of the Lord, and therefore they shall persevere.

A fourth Ground of their perseverance is the stability of the Covenant of *Redemption*, or the certain performance of *every promise* made *mutually* between the *Father* and the *Son*, *between the Lord of Hosts and the Branch*, *when the Council of peace was betwixt them both*, mentioned in *Zach.* 6. 12, 13. When the Father and the Son *agreed* about the *Redemption* of faln man, there were many *Articles* of this *Covenant* and *Council of peace* mutually consented unto, *some* of them relating to the *work* of *Redemption it self*, *others* relating to the *reward* of the *Redeemer*, as you may read in *Isai.* 53. Now this was one promise which the Father made unto the Redeemer, *viz.* That he should not die in vain, but *that he should see of the travail of his soul, and should be satisfied*, Vers. 10. Now *should* true Believers finally *fall*, Christ Jesus should not attain that *satisfaction* which is *here* promised. The Mother is not satisfied with an *abortive* birth; nor would the *Hebrew* women have been *satisfied* if their children had been murthered as soon as born; neither can Christ be willing that those for whom his soul was in *agony* should finally *perish*: The end of Christ's sufferings was not only to bring *forth sons unto God*, but also to *bring those sons unto Glory*: Now should Christ fall short in this latter work; first, he could not (according to the Author to the *Hebrews*) be a perfect Captain of Salvation: *For it did become him for whom all things, and by whom all things are, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the Captain of Salvation perfect through sufferings*, Heb. 2. 10. Secondly, Christ could not be able in the day of Judgment to say as it follows, Vers. 13. *Behold, I and the children which God hath given me.* But Christ is a perfect Saviour, and will at that great day say to God as he doth in *John* 17. 6, 12. *Thine they were, and thou gavest them me, and they have kept thy word: I have kept them, and none of them is lost but the son of perdition.* In which words there is not only intimated a *Covenant*, and an *Agreement* between the *Father* and the *Son* about the Redemption of the elect, but there is also *expressed* in them the faithful *discharge* of the mutual agreement on both sides; so that not one of those that were God's by *election*, and intrusted in Christ's hand *by donation*, shall be lost: *Judas* was therefore a *son of perdition*, because given only *externally*, and not *eternally* into Christ's hand.

4 Arg. From the nature of the Covenant of Redemption, and the mutual promises made between the Father and the Son.

The fifth Argument I shall use is this, If Christ did *pray while* he was on *Earth*, and doth *now intercede* in *Heaven*; that all the elect (who are effectually called) may persevere; then they shall persevere: The Ground of this Argument you have in *John* 11. 42. where Christ tells

5 Arg. Because Christ hath prayed that they might persevere.

us, *that the Father did hear him always:* ſo that if I prove that Chriſt hath prayed for the perſeverance of Believers, I ſhall *thereby prove* their certain perſeverance. I beſeech you therefore conſider a few Verſes of the 17 Chapter of *John*, and you will find that in Verſe 9. Chriſt expreſly tells us, that He did pray for *all* the elect, and for them only; and Verſe 11. he tells us, that perſeverance was the very matter of the petition which he put up, *Holy Father, keep them through thy Name*; and Verſe 15. he explains how he would have them kept, namely, from the *evil*, or from all evil: And leſt any one ſhould ſay that this prayer was made only for ſome *few* that were then *called*, Chriſt adds, Verſ. 20. that *he prayed for all that ſhould believe, or be effectually called at any time after*; and as perſeverance was fundamentally petitioned for, ſo Chriſt (upon that *Foundation*) doth carry his petitions higher, for Verſe 21. he prays for them that they might attain *a higher degree of union with himſelf*; and Verſe 22. *that they might attain a likeneſs of glory with himſelf*; and Verſe 23. *that they might attain to be loved, as he himſelf was loved of the Father.* Now if all theſe petitions which Chriſt made for all the elect ſhall be infallibly granted, (as I have proved they ſhall from Chriſt's own words) then it doth *neceſſarily follow* that all the elect ſhall *perſevere* unto glory. And yet I ſhall add one thing more for a farther Confirmation of this Argument, *viz.* That as the perſeverance of Believers is ſecured by the *prayer* which Chriſt made for them when he was on Earth, ſo they are yet more ſecured by the *interceſſion* that Chriſt makes for them *now* in *Heaven.* The Author to the *Hebrews* doth moſt fully prove that Chriſt *is able to ſave to the uttermoſt* all that come to God by him, (which he ſhould not be, if all true Believers ſhould not perſevere to glory) by this ſtrong Argument, *Becauſe he ever lives to make interceſſion for them:* as he prayed on *Earth*, ſo he prays in *Heaven*, and will *ever live* to pray for them. I conclude this Argument thus: If Chriſt's *prayer* were *effectual* to keep *Peter* from *final falling*, and to raiſe him up when he *had fallen foully*; if it kept the *habit* of his faith from *failing*, when it failed in the *act*; upon the ſame account the faith of *every* Believer is certainly ſecured (as to its principle) by the prayer which Chriſt *did* make for him on *Earth*, and *now* makes for him in *Heaven.*

See Ameſii Coron Colloq. Hag.

Εἰς τὸ παντελὲς. Petrus negans Chriſtum non perdidit fidem, ſed peccavit contra ejus confeſſionem. Cor. Lap in Exod. 32. v. 5.

6. From the inhabitation and inoperation of the Spirit.
1 Cor. 3. 16.
2 Cor. 6. 16.

My laſt Argument for the Saints perſeverance ſhall be taken from the conſtant *inhabitation*, and powerful *inoperation* of the Spirit of God *in* and *upon* the hearts of true Believers: *Believers are the Temples of the Holy Ghoſt, and God lives in them, and walks in them.* The Spirit *infuſes* Grace, and he alſo *actuates* Grace in them, and this *preſerves* and *keeps* them from falling. Not the Grace *wrought*, but the Spirit *working* Grace, doth preſerve Grace. Every prudent perſon will ſecure the place of *Habitation*; the Spirit of God dwelling in Believers, *&c.* doth *ſuper-intend* their minds by a conſtant *inſpection* over them: Chriſt aſſures Believers, *That he would pray the Father, and he ſhould give them another*

Joh. 14. 16, 17.

another Comforter that should abide with them, viz. *even the Spirit of truth that should dwell in them.* If the Spirit of God abides and dwells in Believers for ever, then they cannot *finally fall:* The work of the Spirit in Believers is an *abiding work*, or an abiding anointing; it abides in *them*, and it causes them to abide in *God.* In the great work of Regeneration, the Spirit doth infuse radicated and fixed habits of Grace, and it works such a principle as continues and abides for ever: Hence it is called an *incorruptible seed*, 1 Pet. 1. 23. and a *remaining seed*, 1 John 3. 9. Moreover, the Spirit of God is said to establish Believers unto Salvation, in as much as it is given as a *seal*, and *earnest thereof into our hearts*, according to 2 Cor. 1. 22, 23. *Now he that establisheth us with you, and hath anointed us, is God, who hath sealed us, and given us of his Spirit in our hearts.* Observe here, first, that all true Believers are confirmed and established, and therefore they shall persevere: secondly, that the way of God's establishing them is by God's pouring upon them a holy Unction, or the anointing of his Spirit: thirdly, that this anointing gives security in the nature of a *Seal*, and an earnest; a Seal both obliges the Insurer, and also manifests the Assurance; an earnest doth so much also, and more, for it implies also something given in present possession: God working true Grace by his Spirit, secures us of Heaven as he secured Israel of *Canaan*, by giving them *Escol*, some Clusters of *Canaan's Vineyards* in the wilderness, which was a kind of Livery and Seizon, as when possession of an Estate is given by a Twig or Rod. God's giving of his Spirit is called *his giving of the first-fruits*, Rom. 8. 23. thereby indicating our assured full Harvest, whereof this is an actual part: all those must needs be assured of Glory, who have a possession of Grace; and this seems to be the Argument of the very Text, *viz.* If ye do these things ye shall never fall; why? because *hereby an entrance shall be administred to you into the Everlasting Kingdom.* Possession is the best assurance, 'tis eleven Points; now by the Spirits indwelling in Believers, they have a kind of prepossession of Glory.

See Gregorius de Valv. in primam secundæ Aq. q. 3.

Ὁ βεβαιώσας ἡμᾶς, καὶ δοὺς τὸν ἀρραβῶνα τοῦ πνεύματος ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν.

Ἀρραβὼν est pars præmii periculo parta Beza in loc.

Ἀπαρχὴ τοῦ πνεύματος.

2 Pet. 1.

It remains now only that I speak to the second general Proposition included in the Text, *That it is the duty of every Believer to give all diligence to make his calling, election and perseverance sure.* This Proposition being of the nature of an Inference drawn from the former Proposition, and being also rather matter of practice than of controversie, I shall but briefly, and by way of Application speak unto it: yet here also the great *Goliah* of the Philistines stands in our way; for when *Bellarmine* is no more able to maintain the impossibility of attaining assurance, he then retreats to this second redoubt, and tells us, that no man is bound to gain this assurance, although perchance he might possibly attain to it if he would labour after it. I must with as few words as may be drive him out of this hold, and we shall draw towards a conclusion. I shall therefore prove, *that it is a Believers duty to give diligence*

2 *Gen. Prop.* *'Tis a Believers duty to give diligence to make his calling, &c. sure.*

Nemo tenetur ad habendam hanc certitudinem, etiamsi forte possit habere. Bel. lib. Just. 8. Cap. 3.

gence to make his calling, election and perseverance sure, from a double necessity incumbent upon him.

Necessitate præcepti.

1. 'Tis a Believers duty from the necessity of the command: there can be no plainer or more express command than the words in the Text; and a parallel place with the Text is that of the Author to the *Hebrews*. Heb. 6. 11. We desire (*i. e.* in God's Name we require) that every one of you do shew the same diligence to the full assurance of hope unto the end. Brethren, I might have used it as a strong Argument for the possibility of attaining assurance, because God hath so strictly enjoined us to effect it: for *nemo tenetur ad impossibile*, that no man is bound to impossibilities, is a true Rule, taking it of natural impossibility. Now there is nothing more clear than that we are bound to endeavour after assurance, by virtue of God's precept, which is so full as that many other duties are therefore enjoined because they are necessary means for our attaining assurance. Thus we are commanded, 1. To search the Scriptures; 2 Cor. 13. 5. 2. To search and try our ways; 3. To search and examine our hearts. The end of all this searching of the Word as the Rule, and of our hearts and lives, as the things to be regulated by the Word, is but that we might come to an assured knowledge of the agreement or disagreement that is between them.

2. Many duties are enjoined Believers, because 'tis supposed diligence hath been given, and assurance thereby attained. Such as these, a Believer is commanded, 1. To come with boldness and humble confidence to the Throne of Grace. 2. To rejoice in the Lord always. 3. To give God glory by believing. 4. To tell others what great things God hath done for their souls. 5. To comfort one another, and strengthen the faith of one another; all which duties are commanded, because the attaining of assurance is first commanded, and that first command is supposed (by these other commands) to have been obeyed: for no man can come in the Spirit of adoption, and (with a filial confidence) cry, *Abba, Father*, who first knows not himself to be a son by the image he bears. No man can rejoice in the Lord as he ought to rejoice, till he knows his name be written in Heaven, because the Law of God is written in his heart. How can a Captive triumph, or a Man in Chains dance? How can an *Hebrew*-song be sung in *Babylon*, in a strange Land? Again, when it is required that we should live in perpetual adoration of Divine Goodness, and in admiration of Free Grace, and that we praise, and bless, and magnifie the Name of God, giving him Glory by believing, this supposes that we do believe, and also that we know we do believe: For 'tis the joy of the Lord that gives us strength to do his Will, and doth enlarge our hearts to speak good of his Name.

Gal. 4. 6.

Luke 10. 20.

Neh. 8. 10.

2. *Diligence is necessary*, necessitate medii.

The second Argument, proving it the duty of Believers with diligence to endeavour after assurance, is, because this diligence is necessary *necessitate medii*, as a necessary means. Here I desire you to consider these two things: 1. That diligence is a necessary means for attaining assurance.

assurance. 2. That assurance is a necessary means for the effecting some ends which we are bound to accomplish; but are such as without a certain knowledge of our interest in God, they are not possibly attained.

1. Diligence is a most proper and necessary means for attaining assurance. Faith of *adherence* (as one says) comes by *hearing*, but Faith of assurance comes not without *doing*. In God's giving first Grace, we are *truly passive*; but *before God causes all Grace to be in us, and to abound*, he makes us active and diligent: both in the *direct* act of Faith and also in the *reflex* act of it, it may be said, that *acti agimus*, we act being acted; yet there is some difference between our *living*, and *moving*, and *having* our *being* in God: for as the Child owes the *first principle* of its life wholly to *God* and its *Parents*, wherein 'tis wholly *passive* in it self, but *(afterwards)* the *exercise* of those principles *depends* upon God's *enabling* of the *Child* to put forth those acts that properly *flow* from a vital principle; so first-principles, or the habits of Grace are (as I have already shewn) infused by God alone, but the *acts* and *exercise* of Grace are from God's *concurse* with *our faculties* and *powers*. We are bidden *to work out our Salvation with fear and trembling*, notwithstanding it be most true *that God works in us both to will and do of his own good pleasure*. You see a just acknowledgment of *God's Grace* may be conjoined with a clear revelation of *man's natural power before conversion*, and of a *Believer's moral power after regeneration*, and both of them enforcing and engaging unto the greatest diligence, even from their conjunction and concurrence: for these things are very *harmonious* in themselves; 'tis man's *ignorance* or *peevishness* that *divides* the things that God hath *conjoined*. Acknowledgment of Free Grace in its *power*, *efficacy*, and *discriminating* prerogative, when *duly* considered, doth most effectually put us upon *diligence*. Men can easily reconcile those two Texts, where in one place 'tis said, the *hand* of the diligent makes rich; in the *other*, the blessing of God maketh rich; men understand these things as they concur in natural things, I think they might as well be understood as relating to spiritual riches, riches of assurance, diligence with God's blessing being a proper means for gaining assurance.

1. *Diligence a means to gain assurance.*

2 Pet. 2. 13.

Prov. 10. 4. Prov. 10 22.

Col. 2. 2.

2. Assurance is a most *proper means* for the more speedy attaining many excellent ends, which *without it* are most *difficultly* accomplished: and here I might enumerate many particulars; for indeed there is scarce any *one* act of Grace that can be (in any measure or degree) *so well* exercised by a person *ignorant* of his spiritual estate, as by *him* who *knows* that relation which he *stands* in to God, neither is any duty so well performed *before* assurance, as *after* that God hath *sealed* to a Believer the *pardon* of his sin. But I must mention only *some* consequents of assurance, *so* many as may stop the mouth of that *Rabsheka*, *Bellarmine*, whose *last Argument* against assurance is this, *That 'tis not convenient*

2. *Assurance a proper means helping us to attain more grace.*

Non expedit ut homines certitudinem de gratia propria ordinarie habeant. Bell. lib. 2. de Just. cap.

nient that men attain to assurance ordinarily of the truth of Grace in their hearts; and his reason is, because *it tends* to *carelessness* and *sloth*. And *Petrus a Soto* saith, That *it is not only most humble, but most safe to doubt of the Grace and favour of God.* For *Confutation* hereof, I shall instance in three effects or consequents of true assurance, which are of great import, but are difficultly obtained by those that want assurance.

1. A more compleat Victory over the actings of remaining sin and corruption; this is much furthered by assurance. 'Tis with Believers as it was with the *Israelites*, they *bowed down* under the Oppression of *Egypt* so long, as they *despaired* of deliverance; but when God had *assured* them of his love and favour, and had given them a *promise* of bringing them forth from bondage; a *new spirit* immediately *came upon* them, and they suddenly *vindicated* themselves from slavery: they cast off their *Oppressors Yoke*, and *went forth* to liberty, not leaving one hoof behind them. Thus *despondent* persons, (who nourish their own fears) like *Issachar* may couch down between these *two* burthens, 1. *sight* of guilt, 2. and *sense* of strong corruptions; but when Gospel-grace appears, and a *sight* of the souls interest in the *strength* and *power* of Christ is once manifest, presently the soul *lifts up its head*, and breaks this yoke off from its neck, and bids defiance to its old *lusts*, and *goes forth conquering and to conquer.* Our Adversaries do indeed speak evil of the things they know not, and because they want this experience,
Acts 15. that assurance doth most effectually purifie the heart; and are ignorant that he that hath the most assured *hope*, *does* most industriously *design to*
1 Joh. 3. 6. *purifie himself as God is pure:* therefore they blaspheme this most sacred Truth; they deny Scripture; and (were it not for shame) would accuse Christ and his Apostles (*Peter* and *Paul*) for Libertines, as the Pharisees sometimes did. But was it not Christ's common method, *first* to say to afflicted souls, *Your sins are forgiven*, and then *take up thy bed and walk?* And again, did he not *first* say, Thou art made whole, and *then* said, sin no more? Christ's opinion (or rather his certain knowledge) was *this*, that the *sense* of forgiveness was the most *potent* principle of love and obedience; Christ *tells us*, *that* Mary Magdalen *therefore loved much, because much was forgiven her.* If *Paul* understood
Tit. 2. 11. any thing of Gospel-principles, it was his Doctrine, that the more clear *the Grace of God doth appear, the more effectually it doth teach to deny all ungodliness and worldly lusts, and to live soberly, righteously, and holily in this present world.* Our Adversaries forget that assurance is attainable by *none* but *true* Believers: now 'tis impossible that *true Believers* should turn the *Grace* of God *into wantonness*. We affirm, that this *new name*, and the *white stone*, is never given to any *but those that are partakers of the new nature*, to such as are *regenerate.* God *first* principles the heart with holiness, and *then* smiles upon it; and for a *holy* person to know that he is *so*, can be no occasion to disobedience. I ask, *Who* is more obliged, or *who* feels the obligation to observance *most cogently?*

gently? The *Son* who *knows* his near relation, and knows his Father loves him; or the *Servant* that hath great reason to *doubt* thereof? God's Spirit *seals* none but those it hath in measure *sanctified*; neither would God reveal his love, but that he *knows the constraining power of it.* Fear is a *weak* and *impotent* principle, in comparison of *love:* the Apostle saith, *The Law was weak*; the terrour of its curse *weakened* and *infeebled* the hands of those that should have obeyed it: but the Gospel-Declaration of Grace is *mighty* and *prevailing*, because it comes in the *power* of love. Terrours may *awaken*, love *enlivens*: terrours may *almost perswade*, love *over perswades*. *Felix* may *tremble*, and remain *unconverted: Zacheus* hears of *certain Salvation*, and makes haste to come down, *and receives Christ gladly.* Legal terrours may *move* affections, and *storm* the passions; but they make no *change* upon the will, and therefore there is no *saving* or *through* work effected; (as when a party of Souldiers only *storm the Out-works* of a Garison, they are soon *again* repelled) but the Gospel takes the *heart*, the *main* Fort, upon friendly Articles, and *voluntary surrender*, and the soul becomes a most willing *tributary* and *subject* to its *new* Governour. Fear may force and offer violence, and commit a *rape* upon the heart, but can effect no *Contract* or Marriage-Covenant, for that is wrought only by love, and that in its *clearest evidences* and manifestations. 'Tis true, the Papists (who are great enemies to Marriage) will *here* be ready to object, that *oftentimes* affections cool *after Marriage*, which were strong *before*; and so it may happen *after* a Believer's knowledge of his interest in Christ.

Rom. 8. 5.

Oderint dum metuant *cannot be divided.*

I answer, that the *Apostate Church of Rome* (to which the Spirit of God gives the title of the great Whore, and of the Mother of Fornications and Adulteries both Spiritual and Civil) doth much delight to cast all the blemishes (they can) upon the *state* of Marriage, *civilly* or *spiritually* considered; but more innocent persons do know, that *interest* did never *lessen* love, nor the *knowledge* of interest *abate affection*, but rather *increase it:* all persons find that *relation* hath a strange influence upon men's minds to *endear* those objects that might otherwise be but *little taking.* Sure I am that a Believer's knowledge that his beloved is *his*, and he is *his beloveds*, is found by experience to lay the most *strong* and cogent Obligation upon him to *loyalty* and *faithfulness* unto the the Lord Jesus: for, as to him that believes, Christ is precious; so, to him that *knows* he believes, to him Christ is *so much the more* precious, even the chiefest of ten thousand.

Amat ille non immerito qui amatur sine merito. Amat sine fine qui cognoscit se amatum fuisse a principio, Ber. ep. 107.

2. As assurance furthers our love to Christ, (and so gives power over sin) so it gives strength to *overcome the world*, and *all* the temptations of it, of what kind soever, be they either, *First*, *on the right hand*, *viz.* the smiles, flatteries, allurements and inticements of the world; Assurance of an interest in God very much facilitates our conquest over all these. The *fore-sight* and prospect of Heaven, carries the soul so *high* in its contemplation of Glory, as when it *looks down* upon worldly enjoyments,

2. *Victory over temptations of the world.*
1. *On the right hand.*

joyments, they appear small, little, and very inconsiderable. *Moses,*
Heb. 11. 23. after God had *assured* him of his love, and had caused his *Glory to pass before* him, how did he *scorn* to be tempted with the bait of being reckoned and accounted the son of *Pharaoh*'s daughter? *He refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter, and chose rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin that are but for a season, esteeming the reproaches of Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt.* Whence arose this braveness and true greatness of mind? The Text tells you, *He had respect to the recompence of reward.* He knew
Aug. lib. Confess. 3. quam suave est deliciis hisce carere, &c. the reward was great, and his title to it good. St. *Augustine* tells of himself, that after he had attained assurance of God's love and favour, he was so ravished therewith, as he could not but cry out with a holy exclamation, *Oh how sweet is it to be without the worlds sweets, since I enjoy all sweetness in God! Those things that once I was afraid to lose, I now let go, and want with joy, because hereby I enjoy thee the more.*

2. *Temptations on the left hand.* 2. As to temptations on the left hand, *viz.* The worlds frowns,
2 Cor. 4. 16. threats and persecutions, how little doth an assured person regard them? they are all now accounted and considered *as light and momentary afflictions*, because they are known *to work a far more exceeding and eternal*
Heb. 10. 34. *weight of glory.* We read of true Believers that *endured the spoiling of their* goods with joy; to suffer with *patience* to some is very *hard*, but to others 'tis *joy*, even when they fall into divers temptations; but who are these? the Spirit of God tells us, that they are those *that know within themselves*; mark, within themselves, (*i. e.* by inward evidences, and the testimony of the Spirit witnessing with their spirits) *that they have a better and more enduring substance in Heaven*; these can both forego and undergo cheerfully whatever God requires of them. Ex-
Viget apud nos spei immobilis virtus & firmitas, &c. St. Cyp. Sermone de patientia. cellent is the saying of St. *Cyprian*; *There lives in us*, saith he, *the strength and power of an immoveable faith*; *and hence it is that amongst all the ruines of this tumbling and rolling world, our mind bears up, and our patience always triumphs, because our souls are sure and secure in reference to the eternal love of God.*

3. *Over the fear of death.* 3. Assurance of our Salvation procures Victory over the fear of death. *Old Simeon with Christ in his arms could pray for a dismission hence.* He that hath gotten good *evidences* in his *bosom*, and the Spirit's *testimony* of the pardon of his sin sealed upon his Conscience, will join with *Simeon* in this his petition. Until assurance be attained, 'tis impossible
Heb. 2. 15. but *that men should all their lives long be kept in bondage through the fear of death:* but an assured person can wish for death, and say with *Paul*,
See 2 Cor. 5. 1. *I know that if this earthly Tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, eternal in the Heavens.* *Cupio dissolvi*, I desire to be dissolved. Assurance carries the soul to the top of *Pisgah*, and from thence a Believer (as he hath a general *view* of the *whole Land* of promise, so by the eye of an assuring Faith he) is able to espy *his own lot and portion* in Heaven and Glory; and can he be unwilling to go through *Jordan* (or the Chanel of the Grave) to to take *possession* thereof? As the *least degree* of true Faith takes away the

the *sting* of death, because it takes away *guilt*; so *Plerophory of Faith* breaks the very *teeth* and *jaws* of death, by taking away the *fear* and *dread* of it. When Evidences of an Estate are once sealed and attested, men are not afraid of that *Turf* and *Clod*, which (whilst it defiles their hands) gives them *Livery* and *Seizon* of large Revenues. When a true Believer knows his interest in those *eternal Mansions* of Glory to come, he is not troubled that *his Cottage* of Clay must first be pulled down: The nature of death to a Believer is quite *altered* from what it *was*, and it seems to be *another* thing (in his present apprehension) differing *much* from what he *once* thought it to be. It *once* appeared only the *wages of sin*, but now it appears as the *reward* of patience: It was once thought the *beginning* of *sorrow*, but now the *end* of *sin*, and the *consummation* of *grace*. To a *despairing* person death appears like a grim Sergeant haling to prison; to an *assuring person* it acts the part of a *Master of Ceremonies*, who introduces Foreigners into the presence of the great King. Death holds forth a *Crown* to an assured person; it holds forth an *Ax* to a despairing person; such a change doth assurance make. I shall therefore add no more but the words of *Cyprian*, who discoursing of death, hath these words: *Beloved*, saith he, *the Kingdom of Heaven is begun already in us in joy and peace: there is no place left for fear, or doubting, or sorrow: he only can fear death, that is unwilling to go to Christ; and none can be unwilling to go to him, that know they shall reign with him.* Cyprian de mortalitate.

And thus I have *abundantly* shewn *how instrumental* assurance is for the *increase* of sanctification, and *obtaining* a more *compleat* victory over *Sin*, the *World*, and the fear of *Death*; and I have thereby confuted *Bellarmine*'s grand Argument against assurance, as if it *tended* to licentiousness. The rest of his Objections and Arguments I have also sufficiently obviated; so as I hope every *considering* person will be able (from what hath been spoken) to defend the truth, although the *stile* (of necessity) hath been more *concise* than might have been *desired*: yet I hope those that are *intelligent* will be satisfied with the *matter* of Argument therein contained, although I have been forced to *abbreviate* my Discourse. I must make but little other Application, than, 1. To desire you to *change* the *Arguments* by which I have proved *the necessity* of *diligence*, into *Motives* to put you upon the practice: 2. I shall conclude with some necessary Directions for the better attaining to assurance.

Use.

1. *Give diligence* to make your calling *more sure* in it *self*, by adding *unto faith, virtue*; *unto virtue, knowledge*; *unto knowledge, temperance*, and the rest of those Graces here mentioned by our Apostle. Although now your *calling* may be *sure* and *saving*, yet it may be *more assured*: the Promises were *sure* before Christ's coming, yet he is said to *confirm* them, and make them *more sure*, Rom. 15. 8. A Believer, the more he grows in Grace, *the more effectual* is his calling made; and the more sure it is *in it self*, the more *easily* may he attain to his assurance of it.

1 *Direction, make it more and more sure in it self.* Vocario est primo & per se certa sir. complementum tamen adhuc expectat. Cham. er Tom. 3. lib. 13. cap. 15.

The more *effectual* it is, the more *visible and conspicuous* always is a Believers call. *Little* Grace may be *true* Grace, but *little* Grace is next to *no* Grace; and therefore *weak* Grace is *seldom* discerned: just as those *Motes* or *Atoms* (as they are called) which are small *particles* of dust, (and fly abroad in the Air) are *true* Bodies, but they are *invisible* Bodies: thus while *Faith* is but as a *Grain of Mustard-seed*, it may be true, but it will be *hardly* seen. When love to God is (as a small *spark* of fire covered with a *heap* of ashes) smothered with too great a mixture of *sensual* and *carnal* affections, it is not easily discovered or found without much search: but Faith grown up to a *Tree*, and love blown up to a *flame*, cannot be hid, for thus they render themselves most visible and manifest. That poor woman that had lost her δραχμὴν, (her Groat) was forced *to light her Candle, and sweep diligently her house, and to look long* before she found it, because it was but a *dram*, a very *small* piece; had it been a *Talent*, or *Shekel* of the Sanctuary, it would have been more *easily* found: Let the print be *true* and *exact*, yet if *small*, 'tis often not *legible*, especially to *weak* eyes: If you would attain to assurance, labour to make your calling *more* sure in it self, by growing *eminent* in Grace.

Luke 13.18.

Luke 15.4.

2 *Direction, make it sure to your selves by special assuring graces.*

2. Labour to make it sure to your selves, by attaining *to*, and living *in* the *exercise* of those Graces that are *properly* and more *especially assuring Graces*. The Spirit of God in Scripture hath *declared* that a Believer's *assurance* of Salvation depends upon the exercise of *three* assuring Graces. 1. Πληροφορία συνέσεως, a full assurance of knowledge and understanding. 2. Πληροφορία πίστεως, a full assurance of faith. 3. Πληροφορία τῆς ἐλπίδος, a full assurance of hope.

1. *A full assurance of knowledge*, Col. 2.2. Ἵνα παρακληθῶσιν αἱ καρδίαι αὐτῶν, εἰς πάντα πλοῦτον τῆς πληροφορίας τῆς συνέσεως εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν, &c.

1. Labour for full assurance of knowledge: When St. *Paul* is declaring to the *Colossians*, *how much he desired that the Believers of* Laodicea might have their hearts *comforted* and *assured*, he reveals the way of attaining this, to be by attaining *all riches of full assurance of understanding*; which phrase implies two things: 1. That all those things be known *upon* which a Believers assurance and comforts are *built*; and and these fundamentals are many: there are *several* (προλήμματα, or *præcognita*, several) things must be *foreknown* and *understood* before assurance can be attained; as, 1. You must labour to know the *way* of Redemption and Salvation by the *Mediation* of Christ. 2. You must know the way of a persons *obtaining an interest* in that Mediation; that is, you must know that *Faith* (effectually owning of Christ as Mediator, and deporting it self towards him as such) doth by virtue of the New Covenant *obtain* an interest in that Mediation. 3. You must know by what *signs* or *evidences* true *saving* Faith may be *distinguished certainly* from *temporary* and *ineffectual* Faith. 4. You must know that these certain evidences are found in your heart and life. 2. Full assurance of knowledge, implies a *clear* and *distinct acknowledgment* of all these, with reference to a Believers *well-built* and *grounded comforts*: *Verba sensus*

There is one more Fundamental of assurance then these is of Salvation.

&

& intellectus connotant affectum & effectum. Scripture-phrases of *sense* and *knowledge*, imply a *suitable* affection; and also such *effects* as are *proper* and *agreeing*: there must not therefore be only a *speculative* notion, but also an *influential* and *practical* Application of this knowledge for the founding of assurance thereupon: there must not be only γνῶσις, but ἐπίγνωσις; not only knowledge, but acknowlegment, as it follows in the same Verse.

2. Labour for full assurance of Faith: Now this implies these four things, (which I must but name, as in the former direction.) 1. Labour for full *assent* unto the truth of Gospel-*revelation*. 2. For full *consent* unto Gospel-*method*, *terms*, *conditions* and *commands*. 3. For full *dependance* upon Gospel-*Grace*. 4. For full *experience* of Gospel-*Obedience*, or the Obedience of *Faith*: All these are included in *that full assurance of Faith*, wherewith the Apostle exhorts Believers *to draw near to God*, Heb.10.22. and every one of these acts of Faith must be attained and put in practice before assurance can be attained. 2. *Full assurance of faith.* Heb.10.22.

3. Labour for full assurance of hope. And this supposes two things: First, an actual explicite considering of the grounds of our hope, or a laying a good foundation: all saving hope is rational and well-built. Hopes *Anchor* (in a Believer) holds not by the strength of a *Spider's Web*, as the Hypocrites hope doth; but it holds by the strength of a three-fold Cord, not easily broken; it holds by the evidence of, 1. Testimony, 2. Sense, and 3. Reason. *Bellarmine* (fondly adhering to the Philosophical definition of hope, and) departing from the Scriptural use and acceptation of the word hope, (which is the ground of many errours in the Church of *Rome*) denies that *reason* and *hope* can consist together; and consequently denies also that there is any such thing as *full assurance of hope*, but when he is urged with that plain Text in *Heb. 6. 11. where Believers are exhorted to give diligence for attaining full assurance of hope*, (which supposeth that a full assured hope is in the first place built upon good evidence and proof.) The Jesuite in answer to this, doth most *egregiously* trifle, and doth nonsensically *distinguish* between the certainty of the *will* in *opposition* to the certainty of the understanding; although every *Tyro* knows, that the *will* is no subject of *certainty*, nor can there be any *certainty* of *will separate from* the certainty of the *understanding*: and yet more ridiculous is the Jesuites Argument, when he tells us, that *what* we have *reason* to hope for, we do not *hope* for it, but *expect* it: the folly of which distinction, between hope and expectation) I need not say any thing further to it, than to assure you, that the Apostle *Peter* was wholly ignorant of *Bellarmine*'s Logick, when he exhorts Believer's to be ready to give λόγον περὶ τῆς ἐν ὑμῖν ἐλπίδος, *a reason of the hope that was in them.* But, Secondly, the phrase (*full assurance of hope*) supposes an actual building of our hope upon these good grounds, or an actual conclusion from rational principles, that we are pardoned, and shall be saved: 'tis one thing to consider 3. *Full assurance of hope*, Heb.6.11. Duplex est certitudo, alia voluntatis, alia intellectus: & videtur non posse certitudinem intellectus cum spe convenire, quia quod scimus nos habituros non speramus, sed expectamus, Bell. lib. 13. de Just. cap.11. 1 Pet.3.15.

consider the *grounds* of such a conclusion, another thing to *conclude* actually from those grounds. Assured hope (as it is accompanied with rational evidences, so) 'tis accompanied with right use of right reason to draw the inference: weak hope sometimes (acts as Children will do) it *grants* the *premises*, and yet *denies* the *conclusion*; *but strong hope* is accompanied with a full power to *infer* the *assured* conclusion from those *assured premises*, which those afore-named assuring Graces did lay down. *Knowledge* saith, Whoever believes, shall be saved; *Faith* saith, *Peter* doth believe, therefore Hope saith *Peter* shall be saved. And this Hope is that which will never make ashamed, because hereby the love of God is shed abroad more abundantly in our hearts by the Holy Ghost given unto us, *Rom.* 5. 5. *Let every man* therefore thus *prove his own work, and then he shall have rejoycing in himself, and not in another.*

Dicit fides parata sunt magna dicit spes mihi ista servantur. Bernard. Serm. 50.

Gal. 6. 4.

SER-

SERMON XIX.

Of Indulgences.

Heb. X. 14.

For by one Offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.

THE Apostle gives the Reason, why Christ hath now no more Offering to make, no more Suffering to endure, *For,*] *i. e.* because, *by one Offering,*] i. e. one *in specie*, in opposition to the four kinds of Legal Oblations before mentioned; and one *in numero*, in opposition to the repeating of them every year. *q. d.* By Christs once offering of himself, *he hath perfected,*] *i. e.* all things are consummate, there remains nothing to be done, for the satisfying Divine Justice, and our Reconciliation with God. Christ hath once satisfied, and that *for ever,*] *i. e.* to the end of the World, and that which shall be of value to Eternity; plainly, Christ by his Death hath compleatly done the work once for all, *for them that are sanctified;*] *i. e.* either those that are separated from the world in Gods Purpose and Decree, plainly, the Elect; or *them that are sanctified,*] i.e. those that are renewed by Grace, and consecrated to be Vessels of Honour unto God. In short, Christ hath not so purchased Remission of sins, as to leave some Satisfaction to be made by themselves, or others; No, he hath perfectly satisfied for them, and perfectly expiated all their sins. Which if so, then from this, as well as from other Scriptures, fairly results this Proposition: That,

Papal Indulgences are the worst of Cheats, and abominably injurious to Christ and Christians.

My work here, is to rake in the very Sink of Papal filthineſs. There's no head of Divinity that is not miſchievouſly hurt by this putrid Plaiſter. 'Twas not without Gods ſingular Providence, that the detecting the Pageantry of that Fleſh-pleaſing Religion, began here; for herein their *ſeeming* tender mercies are *real cruelties.*

To evidence what I aſſert, I ſhall in my poor manner endeavour, 1. To ſhew you what the Indulgences are which we juſtly condemn: 2. The unſound Hypotheſes upon which they ſtand: 3. Demoliſh the main Theſis: And, 4. Raiſe ſome profitable Inſtructions above exception.

I. Let's begin with the Name and Definition of Indulgences, which (to paſs by more than (*a*) thirty different Opinions among themſelves,) I ſhall give you in *Bellarmines* own words; after he hath, like a wary Champion, attempted to reconcile, or excuſe his own diſſenting party; (*b*) in the cloſe of his eighth Chapter, he gives us this entire Definition, viz. *Indulgence is a judicial Abſolution from the Guilt of Puniſhment, owing to God, in the penitentiary Court, given over and above the Sacrament, by the Application of the Satisfactions which are contained in the Treaſure of the Church.* He had before told us, (*c*) that the *Church*, and the *Schools*, call Indulgences the *Remiſſions of Puniſhment*, which often remain to be endured after the *remiſſion of faults*, and Reconciliation obtained in the Sacrament of Penance; which Pardons the Popes uſe to grant, at certain times, and not without ſome juſt and reaſonable cauſe, out of their Fatherly gentleneſs, and condeſcenſion towards their Children, pitying their infirmity. This is his, and I'le at preſent wave any interfering deſcription. Let's then examine the *Hypotheſes* of this profitable ſtructure.

a *Voet.* Select. diſp. part ſecund. *p.* 287. Sect. 2.

b *Bellarm.* Diſput. Lugd. 1599. Tom. 3. de indulgen. lib. 1. c. 8. p. 24.

c Id. c. 1. p. 9.

II. The unſound *hypotheſes* (or ſuppoſitions,) upon which they build this profitable Structure, are ſuch as theſe: I'le name four of them.

1. That when the *fault* is pardoned, the *puniſhment* is not pardoned, but there remains an Obligation to puniſhment, which is changed from Eternal to Temporal, for which God muſt be ſatisfied, either by patient bearing his ſtrokes, or by undergoing the Penance injoyned by the Prieſt, or by laborious works freely undertaken, ſuch as Prayers, Faſting, and Alms; or by Indulgences.

Now the Quagmire-Foundation of this Diſtinction may thus appear, both by Teſtimony, by Reaſon, and (which is more than both theſe) by Scripture: I need but touch upon each, it being done more largely by a betterhand; and therefore I will produce but one Teſtimony, and that is of the Archbiſhop of *Spalatro*: "In Pardon to diſtinguiſh (*d*) between Fault "and Puniſhment, ſo as to ſeparate them, is a moſt vain thing, and not "to be admitted, eſpecially in reſpect of God.

d *Marc. Ant.* de Dominis, de Rep. Eccl. lib. 5. c. 8. n. 1.

For reaſons, "'Tis againſt the Nature (*e*) of the thing, that there "ſhould be Puniſhment where there is no Fault, take away the Cauſe "and the Effect muſt ceaſe. What *Bellarmine* ſaith, that the Houſe will "ſtand,

e *Fran. Turretin.* de Satisfac. Chr. perfec. p. 330. n. 24. & ſeqq.

"ſtand; when the Carpenter that built it is dead, doth not infringe what "we affirm; for we ſpeak here of a Meritorious and Moral, not of an "Efficient and Phyſical Cauſe. Wheras it is further ſaid, A King may "pardon a Malefactor, and yet enjoyn him to make ſatisfaction; I an-"ſwer, The King and the party offended are different perſons, the King "may not give away anothers right, we muſt not confound the Court of "Heaven and the Court of Earth. I might adde, 'tis againſt the ordina-"ry manner of ſpeech, to ſay a Judge pardoneth a Malefactor, whom he "puniſheth. 'Tis againſt the Juſtice of God to puniſh one ſin twice. 'Tis "againſt the Mercy of God, to be reconcil'd to a ſinner, and to tor-"ment him. But beyond all this, 'tis againſt the Practice of Chriſt; what "Temporal puniſhment did Chriſt lay upon (*f*) *Mary Magdalen*, upon "(*g*) the Paralytick, the (*h*) great Debtour.

f Luk.7.48.
g Mat.9.2.
h Mat.18.24.

2. A ſecond falſe *hypotheſis* is this: One (*i*) Righteous man may ſatisfie for another, and there are ſome that need no ſatisfaction for themſelves, and therefore theirs may go for others. *e.g.* If *Peter* faſt for *Paul*, then *Paul* need not faſt, but God pardons him the puniſhment, which he ſhould have ſatisfied for by faſting, *&c.* The groundleſneſs of this Hypotheſis may be thus evidenced.

i Voet. ibid. p. 289.

Jeſus Chriſt hath perfectly ſatisfied for our ſins, and therefore men are not bound to ſatisfie in part for themſelves; (*k*) Chriſt is *the Propitiation*, (*l*) *our Redemption.* (*m*) *God was in Chriſt reconciling the World unto himſelf, not imputing their treſpaſſes unto them.* I need name no other Text than that I am diſcourſing of: (*n*) *By one Offering he hath perfected for ever them that are ſanctified.* To ſay, Chriſt ſatisfied, that our Satisfactions might be accepted, and ours depends upon his, (*o*) this is to illude Scripture, *q. d.* Chriſt once ſatisfied, that we might alwayes ſatisfie, Chriſt perfectly ſatisfied For us, that he might imperfectly ſatisfie In us; Chriſt hath ſatisfied for Eternal puniſhments, but doth ſatifie for Temporal when Believers themſelves ſatisfie. O excellent way of anſwering! Again, if men muſt in part ſatisfie for their ſins, then they are not freely pardoned; but how eaſie is it to multiply expreſs Scriptures; (*p*) take notice but of one Epiſtle: *Juſtified freely by his Grace. To him that worketh, is the reward not reckoned of Grace but of Debt. If by Grace, then it is no more of Works. &c.* Now if none can ſatisfie for themſelves, then they cannot ſatisfie for others. (*q*) *If thou be wiſe, thou ſhalt be wiſe for thy ſelf; but if thou ſcorneſt, thou alone ſhalt bear it.* But, ſhould we ſuppoſe what can no way be granted, how can they ſpeak of the Communication of mens good Works, while they explode the Imputation of Chriſts Righteouſneſs, and ſcornfully call it a putatitious Juſtification? But more of this in the next.

k 1 Joh.2.2.
l 1Cor. 1. 30.
m 2 Cor.5. 19.
n Heb. 10.14.
o Ant. Sadeel. de ver. pec. rem. p. (mihi) 97, &c.
p Rom. 3. 24. 4. 4. 11.6.
q Prov.9.12.

3. A third abſurd *hypotheſis* is this, That the ſuperfluous ſatisfactions of Chriſt, and eminent Saints, are laid up in a Treaſury, to be laid out for thoſe that want.

The abſurdity of this is manifeſt more wayes than I have time to

r *Plac.* Thes. Salm, part. 2. p. 72. & seqq.

mention, (r) beside the absurdity of Parcelling out the death of Christ, to apply one part of it to one use, and another part to another use; whereas all and every part of it is offered and applyed to every Believer; 'Tis further absurd to divide that which is sufficient, from that which is superfluous, when what is infinite is indivisible; and to say, that one drop of the Blood of Christ, is sufficient for the saving of a thousand Worlds, and to reckon all the rest superfluous, and not so much as one person saved by it, that would not have been saved without it, what can be more absurd and blasphemous? I would further enquire, whether under the Old Testament, Believers were bound to satisfie God for Temporal punishments? if they were, let them prove it; if they were not, then God dealt more mercifully with them under the Old Testament, than with Believers under the New; and the Satisfaction of Christ not exhibited, is more efficacious than since his exhibition. Once more, if the Satisfaction of Christ be more than enough, what need the addition of Humane Satisfactions? they say, lest they should be in vain. So then, 'tis no matter though Christs Satisfaction be in vain, Saints must not lose their glory; 'tis no matter with them though Christ lose his. In their account, Christ and Saints must share the work of Redemption between them; Saints must be our Priests, our Sureties, we must believe in them, and place our hope in their Satisfactions; but before we do so, 'tis adviseable, to solve this Doubt, Whether the Treasury of Saints superfluous Satisfactions be Infinite or Finite? if Infinite, then they are sufficient to redeem the World, which I think none hath impudence to affirm; if Finite, what security may we have, ere we part with our Money, that the Treasury is not exhausted, upon the large Grants already made? but they'l tell them the Bank is inexhaustible; In the next place therefore let's consult the Treasurer.

4. The fourth tottering *hypothesis* is this, That the Pope hath the chief power of dispensing this Treasury to those members that need it.

Though I might turn off this with that trite Maxim, That which hath no Being, hath no Accidents; if there be no such Treasury, there need be no controversie about the dispensing of it; and though I might bespeak them to agree among themselves, whether hath greater power, the Pope or a Council, before they quarrel with us about what themselves are not agreed: And though I may well suppose, that the Popes Supremacy is already confuted in this Exercise; but to let pass all this, (s) what a fair Dividend do they make of the Satisfaction of Christ, while they allow every Priest to dispose of it for the pardon of *faults*, and of *eternal* punishments, but reserve the disposal of that part of it to the Pope, whereby to pardon *temporal* punishments? How egregiously also do they trifle, while they distinguish between *Satisfaction*, and the *Payment* of Satisfaction: Satisfaction they say, was made by Christ and Saints, but the payment of it is by the Pope; that was done long since, this is still in

s *Thes. Salm.* ibid. p. 81, &c.

doing,

doing; as if the satisfaction of Christ were like a summe of Money layd up in a Chest, to be layd out upon occasion: Whereas we know no other Gospel treasury, but what is dispensed by the Spirit of God, by the Word and Sacraments. (*t*) It is the *Gospel that is the power of God unto Salvation, to every one that believeth,*--- and *Therein is the Righteousness of God revealed.* But I shall speak more to this in my next Attempt to overturn their *main* Thesis, which is this.

(t) Rom. 1.16,17

That the Pope through the fulness of Apostolical power, may grant a most full Pardon by Indulgences: This is expressd most fully by *Clement* the sixt, (*u*) who speaketh thus: "Of that infinite Treasure that "is obtained for the Church Militant, God would not have it to be laid "up in a Napkin, or hid in a Field, but hath committed it to *Peter*, that "bears the Keyes of Heaven, and to his Successor-Vicars on Earth, "to be wholsomely dispensed upon fit and reasonable Causes, sometimes "for the total, sometimes for the partial Remission of temporal Punish-"ments, both generally and specially due for Sins, to be mercifully ap-"plyed to the truely penitent, and confess'd.

(u) Decret. Grat. Tom. 2. extrav.com.lib. 5.c.2. p. 352.

In the Anatomy of this Thesis, I shall endeavour to discover these things, *viz.* 1. The *falseness* of it; 2. The *Novelty* of it; 3. The *Contradictions* in it; 4. The *Cheats* of it; 5. It's *Injuriousness* to Christ; 6. Its *Mischief* to Christians.

First, To convince you of the *falseness* of this Position, I shall first give you plain Scripture-proof, That there's no pardon of sin but by the Mercy of God, *through the Blood* of Christ, received by Faith. † *In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his Grace.* (*x*) *Being justified by Faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ.* (*y*) *Who shall lay any thing to the charge of Gods Elect? It is God that justifieth; who is he that condemneth? it is Christ that died;* &c. Many more Texts might be alleadged, but I had rather say onely what is enough, than all. But our Adversaries pretend also to Scripture-warrant, though *Durand* (*z*) confesseth, that concerning Indulgences there can but little be said upon certainty, becaus the Scripture doth not speak expressely of them; for that which is said to *Peter*, *Mat.* 16. 18. *I will give unto thee the Keyes of the Kingdom of Heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt binde*, &c. is to be understood of the power given unto him in the Court of Pœnance, and it is not clear that it ought to be understood of the granting Indulgences: But *Bellarmine* saith, (*a*) "Although Indulgences be not warrant-"ed by particular Scripture, yet they are in general by the power of "the Keyes,---- and they may be warranted by Divine Authority, known "by Tradition of the Apostles: (By the way, let me observe, I do not remember, that ever I read any thing in their Authors about the Popes power in any kind, but this Text is press'd into the service of their design, though ordinarily, to as little purpose as any Text in the Bible,) but Scriptures they bring, let's examine them a little. They argue from

† Ephes. 1.7.

x Rom. 5. 1.

y Rom. 8.33,34

z *Durand.* l. 4. dist. 20. q. 3. p. 791.

a de indulg. l. 2. c. 10. p. 46.

those

thoſe words of the Apoſtle, (*b*) ----- *ye ought rather to forgive him, and comfort him*, &c. in ſhort, The Apoſtle gave Indulgence, ſo may the the Pope. There's enough in the Text to anſwer their Allegation. *e.g.* 1. *Paul* never limited a time for his Repentance, that it muſt be ſo many dayes or years. 2. *Paul* took no price to pay his Debt out of the *Corinthians* Works of Supererogation. 3. The Penitent gave no Money for his Indulgence. And, 4. Which is more than all the reſt, he ſaith *ver.* 10. *To whom ye forgive any thing, I forgive alſo.* This is no way to be endured, (*c*) that the Pope hath no more power to forgive any thing than other Prieſts; I doubt not, but rather than yield that, they'l let go that Text. Another Text they urge, is, (*d*) ----- *my ſufferings for you, and fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Chriſt in my fleſh, for his Bodyes ſake, which is the Church.* Upon which they ſay, that *Paul* ſatisfied for the ſins of other Believers, and by this means did contribute to the enriching the Churches Treaſury of Satisfactions, which the Pope diſpoſeth of by Indulgences: But this is preſuppoſing their Opinion, not proving of it. They grant our Expoſition of the Text to be right. (*e*) 1. That *Pauls* Afflictions are the Afflictions of Chriſt, *i.e.* he ſuffered them for Chriſt, for the Name of the Lord. 2. They made up the laſt part of the Apoſtles task, being the remainder of the Afflictions he had to ſuſtain. 3. They contain an illuſtrious Evidence of his gratitude towards the Lord, that as Chriſt had ſuffered for his Salvation, he ſuffered in his order for the glory of his gracious Maſter. So that here's not a word of Satisfactions, or Treaſury, or Indulgences. Another Text they urge is, (*f*) *that your abundance may be a ſupply for their want, that their abundance alſo may be a ſupply for your want*, q.d. The Church of *Jeruſalem* was poor, and abounded in Merit, the Church of *Corinth* was rich and wanted Merit; take but the plain meaning of the Text, and that will reſcue it from ſuch an abuſe: The *Corinthians* received the Goſpel from ſome of the *Jewiſh* Church, and therefore they ought to relieve their Neceſſities. Beſides their wreſting of Scripture, they argue from that Article of the Creed, *The Communion of Saints*, therefore thoſe that neither do, nor ſuffer what they ought for themſelves, are to be ſupplyed out of what others have done and ſuffered more than they need. Is not this a Conſequence of the largeſt ſize? may they not by ſuch arguing prove every thing out of any thing? Briefly, the Church is called *a Communion of Saints*; becauſe, 1. They are all Members of one Myſtical Body. 2. All the Benefits of Chriſt are communicated to every Believer, they are all called, juſtified, ſanctified, ſaved. 3. They are to do all Offices of Charity one for another, while in this world; but what's all this to works of Supererogation? Let this ſuffice for this firſt particular, and the rather, becauſe the proof of the reſt will alſo prove this. Therefore,

(*b*) 2 Cor. 2. 7. &c.

(*c*) *Chem.* exam. conc. Trid. p. 714. &c.

(*d*) Col. 1. 24.

(*e*) *Daille in loc.* p. 120, 121.

(*f*) 2 Cor. 8. 14.

Secondly, Indulgences are a *Novelty*; the ancient Church neither knew nor practiſed any ſuch thing. That they may not ſay we ſlander them,

them, hear their owu Authors. *Cajetan* who was employed both as *Legat* and *Champion* againſt *Luther* begins thus: (*g*) "If certainty could "be had concerning the beginning of Indulgences, 'twould help us to "ſearch out the truth; but becauſe no written Authority, either of the "holy Scripture, nor of the ancient *Greek* or *Latine* Doctors, hath "brought this to our knowledge; but this onely, from three hundred "years, 'tis written concerning the ancient Fathers, that bleſſed *Gregory* "inſtituted the Stationary Indulgences, *&c.* Which ſhould we grant, (though let them tell us where to find it in his Writings) 'twould not prove them very ancient. And *Roffenſis* himſelf, as that *Italian* quotes him, (for I have him not by me) acknowledgeth, (*h*) That till people were frighted with (the Bug-bear of) Purgatory, no body minded Indulgences, and that he likewiſe acknowledgeth to be but of late years. To convince thoſe of Novelty who ſlander us with it, I'le give you a brief Hiſtorical account of them, how they crept in, and to what a monſtrous height they roſe, till they were ſo top-heavy, that their fall broke off ſeveral branches of that *Tree* (*i*) which overſpread the Weſtern Churches.

g Cajet. opuſc. Tom. 1. Tract. 15. c. 1. p. 46.

h Polyd. Virgil. de rerum invent. lib. 8. c. 1. p. (mihi) 613.

i Dan. 4. 11, &c.

The Diſcipline of the ancient Church was ſuch, that they did neither lightly nor ſuddenly re-admit unto Communion thoſe that denyed the Faith, or ſacrificed to Idols in time of perſecution, or thoſe that at any time fell into Hereſie, or any other ſcandalous wickedneſs; till the Church was ſatisfied in the truth of their Repentance, to evidence which, they required ſuch publick, viſible teſtimonies, ſuch as they judged might moſt probably ſpeak the grief of their heart for ſin, the ſerioufneſs of their deſire of Reconciliation, and their full purpoſe of amendment. The manner of their Repentance was thus, as (*k*) *Nicephorus* relates it: "After 'twas look'd upon as burdenſome for the Offender to confeſs his "fault publickly as upon a Theater, they choſe a Miniſter that was holy, "prudent, and ſecret, to whom thoſe that had offended might open their "caſe, and receive directions what to do, that their ſin might be par-"doned. The *Novatians* took no care of this matter, for they refuſed "to communicate with thoſe that denyed the Faith in the perſecution of "*Decius*; and 'tis ſaid, *This Rite was inſtituted for their ſake*, that they "might be reſtored upon their Repentance. There was a certain place "appointed for the Penitents, where they ſtood with a dejected counte-"nance, greatly bewailing their ſin, till what they might not partake of, "was ended, and then they threw themſelves at his feet that adminiſtred; "then he that was appointed to direct them, ran to them, and mourn-"ing with them, lay down upon the ground, and the whole multitude of "the Church ſtood about them, with many tears lamenting over them; "then the Miniſter roſe up, and bade the Penitents to riſe, and praying "for them as the matter required, diſmiſſed them; then every one betook "himſelf to what was enjoyned him, to macerate themſelves by Faſtings, "and Watchings, and frequent Prayers, and Abſtinence from Delights;

k Niceph. hiſt. Eccleſ. lib. 12. c. 28. p. 279, & ſeqq.

"which

"which when they had performed, they were received into Communion: "this they did to keep the Ordinances pure, and the Church from Re- "proach; but I think (saith he) that the Church is fallen from that an- "cient, venerable Gravity, and hath by little and little departed from "that accurate Discipline. The Church prescribed Rules for Repentance according to the variety of Offences, (*l*) some for the space of several dayes, others for several years, and others during life, allowing the Bishop to abate or adde to the time enjoyned, as he saw occasion. (*m*) 'Twas judged convenient in all cases to try their Repentance, and if the Penitents, did by their fear, and patience, and tears, and good works, demonstrate the unfeignedness of their Conversion, they were to be more gently dealt with. (*n*) But they, as wise Physicians, still imposed fit remedies, *viz.* Humbling Exercises to the Vain glorious; Silence to the Bablers; Watching to the Sluggards; hard Labour to the Slothfull; Fasting to the Gluttonous, *&c.* And in those things that were imposed, (*o*) we are not so much to consider the Length of the Time, as the Depth of the Grief, such as may *satisfie the Church*, (pray mark that, it is the Church, in the truth of their Repentance,) not Gods Justice, so that they might challenge a Pardon. (*p*) We are firmly to believe, that the purging away of sin is done by the Blood of Christ, through the greatness of Gods Mercy, and the multitude of his Compassions. But they were onely enormous sinners, upon whom the ancient Church imposed severities, to evidence the truth of their Repentance; let *Augustine* speak for all, (*q*) who mentions a threefold Repentance: "The first before (*r*) Bap- "tism, which is Conversion, when a man repents of his former Course "of Life, and gives up himself to live in Newness of Life, and upon "these they imposed no Ecclesiastical Censures. The second was, (*s*) a "daily Repentance; and for sins of daily incursion, we are taught to "pray, *Forgive us our Trespasses, &c.* of these the Church took no no- "tice. But there's a (*t*) more grievous and mournfull Repentance, in the "managing of which, Offenders are properly call'd Penitents; this is a "grievous thing, but that the Almighty Physician can cure such; but "O my beloved (*saith he*) let no man propose this kind of Repentance "unto himself; if he have fallen, let him not despair, but let no man "venture upon sin in hopes of Repentance. So that you may see, that whoever will be at the pains to compare the Satisfactions of the Papists with the Satisfactions of the Ancients, they will find them far different. In short, (*u*) "They never used them as necessary for the Pardon of sin, "neither did they hold, that these Satisfactions must be made in this "Life, or endured in Purgatory, which two things if you take away, "you overthrow the Tables of Indulgence-sellers; but they enjoyned "them, 1. That the Name of God might not be blasphemed among "the Heathen, as if the Church were a Receptacle of Belialists, "where they might sin with Impunity. 2. That they might not par- "take of other mens Sins. 3. That others might not be infected, for "sin

l *Decret. Gratian. Tom. 2. Canon Pœnit. p. 2053.. & seqq.*

Concil. Ancyra. can. 5 6, 7, 20, 21, 22, &c. in Concil. Bin. Edit. Tom. 1. p. 275. et seq.

m *Concil. Nicæn. Can. 12, 13. ibid. p. 343.*

n *Basil. Tom. 2. Reg. fus. disput. resp. ad inter. 50. p. 601.*

o *August. Enchirid. cap. 65. Tom. (mihi) 3. p. 230.*

p *Basil. ibid. Reg. brev. resp. ad inter. 10. p. 617.*

q *Aug. de util. pœnit. Tom. 9 p. 1284. & seq.*

r *c. 1.*

s *c. 2.*

t *c. 3.*

u *Chem. Exam. Conc. Trid. p. 725. & seqq.*

"sin is a catching Disease. 4. That Offenders might be more feelingly "convinced of the greatness of their sin. 5. That they might do what "was possible to pull up sin by the roots, *&c.* Whereas the Papists now, as the degenerate Church of *Israel* formerly. † *They eat up the sin of my People, and they set their heart on their iniquity.* The Patrons of Indulgences look at their gain; the Ancients, when they absolved their Penitents, exhorted them to sin no more, but to bring forth fruits worthy of amendment of Life, they put them upon the exercise of the contrary Vertues, but there's nothing of this in Papal Indulgences. In a word, the Ancients carryed on a design of *Heavenly* Interest in their Severities, and the Papists of *Earthly* in their Indulgences. But the Severities of the Ancients were by degrees mollified. Our learned Countrey man gives us the Canons of a Council, in the year 786. where in the last Canon 'tis decreed, (*x*) *That if any one dyed without Penance and Confession, he should not be at all prayed for.* (where then were Indulgences as since granted?) But he gives us the Canon of another Council, in the year 967. *Where the Council closeth the Penitential Canons with* (*y*) *four concerning the Penance of Noble-men,* (*they say expressely in the last Canon, that poor men are not to have any such priviledge,*) *there they give this direction for him that is enjoyned Seven years Fasting: Let him* (*say they*) *for three dayes have twelve Companions to fast with him,* i.e. *to eat nothing but Bread and Water, and Herbs, and let him somewhere else get seven times one hundred and twenty men, to fast every one for him for those three dayes, and so he will fast so many fasting dayes as there are in the whole seven years.* But if yet this be too much, they may have Relief by the Provision before made (*z*) for those that are sick; is it not enough to make a Great man sick, to put him upon three dayes Fasting? which if it do, *for one peny, he may buy off a dayes Fasting, and for thirty shillings a years Fasting.* Is not this fair? But yet this comes not neer the later Markets. But I must not multiply particulars; when they had Churches to build, Hospitals to endow, Bridges to repair, or the like, then Indulgences were granted to fetch in Money: And even then while these good works were proposed, *Gregory* the 9th (*a*) decrees, *That the Alms-gatherers appointed, be modest and discreet persons, that they lodge not in Taverns or unfitting places, that they be not profuse in their Expences,* &c. *Because* (saith he, pray mark his words,) *by the indiscreet and superfluous Indulgences, which some are not afraid to grant, the Keyes of the Church are contemned, and pœnitential Satisfaction is enervated*; and therefore he set limits to the granting of them. But notwithstanding all the little checks they met with, they were more freely granted in the year of *Jubile*. In the year 1300. (*b*) *Boniface* the 8th instituted a Jubile every Hundredth year, wherein he granted not only a full, but a *most* full pardon of all sins, to all those that in such a time shall visit the Churches of the Prince of the Apostles at *Rome*. To me the beginning of the Bull seems considerable, that

† Hos. 4. 8.

x Sir *Hen. Spel. Concil. Brit. in conc. Calchuth. can.* 20. p. 300.

y Idem *Canones dati sub Edgaro Rege.* p. 474. &c.

z Ibid. can. 18. p. 473.

a *Decret. Grat.* Tom. 3. *Decret. Greg.* l. 5. Tit. 38. c. 14. p. 1874.

b *Bullar. Mag.* Tom. 1. p. 204.

grounds it upon a *Report* that great Indulgences were granted (though no body knows *when* nor *where*) to the Visitors of those Churches. Well, but though there never was any such thing before, yet now this easie way of Pardon is broach'd, 'tis pity the time should be so seldom; *Clement* the sixt (*c*) therefore in the year 1350. upon the prayers of the People of *Rome*, reduced the Jubile to every Fiftyeth year, and for so doing, he doth not go upon Report, but founds it upon the Law of *Moses*. (*d*) *Urbane* the sixt, reduced it to Thirty three years; and *Paul* the second (*e*) gives the Reason of it, *viz.* he providently considered, men do not live so long as formerly, and desired that very many more might receive benefit by them, *&c.* which when he hath done, as also how that Reduction was confirmed by *Martin* the fifth, and *Nicholas* the Fifth, he then expresseth his greater Kindness in reducing the Jubile to every 25th year; and *Alexander* the sixth, (*f*) in the year 1500. enlarged the Jubile to those that could not, or neglected to come to *Rome*. And thus I have (though with omiting more than I have express'd) brought them down to *Leo* the 10th, (*g*) who exercised such an excessive power in this matter, that there is not (saith *Ranchin*) a good Catholick but is sorry for it. Take the matter of fact from that excellent Historian (*h*) *Thuanus*, who wrote onely the History of his own time, and therefore might well be more exact. "In the year 1515. *Leo* the tenth, a "man giving himself to all Licentiousness, by the instigation of Cardinal "*Lorenzo Puccio*, a turbulent man, to whom he ascribed too much, that "he might from all parts scrape up Money for his vast Expences, he sent "his Bulls of Indulgences through all the Kingdoms of the (Papal) Chri-"stian World, wherein he promised the expiation of all sins, and Eter-"nal Life; and there was a price set what every one should pay, ac-"cording to the grievousness of his Sin. To which end he appointed Col-"lectors and Treasuries throughout the Provinces; adding to them, "Preachers to recommend to the People the greatness of the Benefit: "these by Sermons artificially composed, and by Pamphlets openly pub-"lished, immoderately extolled the Efficacy of these Indulgences. These "Bulls were executed with too much Licentiousness in many places, but "especially in *Germany*; where those that farmed them from the Pope, "did lavish out their power of drawing Souls out of Purgatory, shame-"lessly spending it every day in Whore-houses and Taverns, at Dice, and "most filthy uses. I shall forbear to insist upon the abominable Expressions of those that preach'd up these Indulgences, such as this, *viz.* *That there is no sin so great, but that if a man should (which is impossible) deflour the Mother of God, he might by Indulgences be pardoned both Fault and Punishment.* *Chemnitius* (*i*) mentions several stories, to whom I referre you; and shall somewhat more largely aquaint you with the very words of some of the Hundred Grievances of the Princes of the *Roman* Empire, assembled at *Noremberg*, in the Years 1522, and 1523. The third, fourth, fifth and sixth Grievances, are unto the Title of *The Burdens*

of

c *Ciacon. vit. Pont.* p. 903.

d Idem p. 998.

e *Bullar. mag.* Tom. 1. p. 401, 402.

f *Ciacon. vit. Pontif.* p. 1343.

g *Review of the Council of Trent.* l. 5. c. 1. p. 249.

h *Thuan. histor.* l. 1. p. 13.

i *Chem. Exam. Conc. Trid.* p. 744, 745.

of Papal Indulgences: (*k*) "Their third Grievance is about the Increase "of the intolerable burden of Indulgences, when under the shew of Piety, "for the Building of Churches, or an Expedition against the *Turks*, the "Popes suck the Marrow of their Estates; and which heightens the Im- "posture, by their hireling Cryers and Preachers, Christian Piety is "banish'd, while to advance their Market, they cry up their Wares, for "the granting of wonderfull, unheard of, peremptory Pardons, not onely "of sins already committed, but of sins that shall be committed by those "that are alive, and also the sins of the dead---- So that by the sale of "these wares, together with being spoyl'd of our Money, Christian pie- "ty is extinguished; while any one may promise himself impunity, upon "paying the rate that is set upon the sin he hath a mind to commit: hence "Whoredoms, Incests, Adulteries, Perjuries, Murders, Thefts, *&c.* and "all manner of wickedness, have at once their Off-spring. What wic- "kedness will mortal men be afraid to commit, when they may promise "themselves licence, and impunity of sinning, while they live, and for a "little more Money Indulgences may be purchased for them after they "are dead? Especially the *Germans*, who are of a credulous temper, "and easie to be perswaded by pretences of piety, and a shew of Reli- "gion. A Fourth Grievance was this, That the Indulgences were sold "for Defence against the Barbarians, but the Mouey was laid out to "maintain the Luxury of Kindred, and to advance their Families.---- "The Fifth was this, That the Pope, and the rest of the Bishops and "Pillars of the *Roman* Church have alwayes some Cases reserved, for "which you must make a new Bargain, and pay more Money, or no "Dispensation. The sixth was this, That if any one have wherewithall "to pay, he may not onely be indulged the present transgression of these "Constitutions (about reserved Cases) but they may be permitted to "transgress them for the future; whence those that are dispensed with, "take occasion to commit Perjuries, Murders, Adulteries, and such like "wickedness, which all springs from the cursed Covetousness of some "Ecclesiasticks. I might adde more out of their Seventh Grievance, "about the Stationary Preachers of Indulgences, of whom the Princes "complain, that they devour the very Blood and Marrow of the poor, "and themselves live in more than *Sybaritical* Luxury and Delights. But I'le transcribe no more of this; I would not indeed have transcrib'd so much, but that the Book whence I have it, is but in few hands: And that what I have said, may not be tedious, I le refresh you with a story.

(*l*) A Noble-man told *Tecelius* (the chief Publican of Indulgences) that he had a mind to commit a very heinous sin, and he desired *present* Pardon of that *future* sin: *Tecelius* for a great summe of money gives him the Indulgence, the Noble-man pays down the Money, and re- ceives his Bull: Afterwards, the Noble-man took occasion in a certain Wood to rob *Tecelius*, and break open his Chests of Indulgences; and when *Tecelius* threatned him with all manner of Curses, the Noble-man

k *Fasciculus rerum expetendarum, fol.* 177, 178.

l *Chemnit.* Ib. p. 745.

shewed him his Bull of Indulgences, that he payd so dear for, and laughing at him, told him, this was the Sin that he had a mind to commit, when he was so fully absolved. 'Twould drive out this Discourse into too great a length, to (but particularly) mention the several Conferences, Disputations, Writings, Diets, that pass'd for above twenty years, ere the Council was assembled at *Trent*, and to mention what was done there at several times for above twenty years more, e're they so much as attempted to debate the business of Indulgences, and when 'twas attempted, how they durst (*m*) not meddle with that Fistula, but shuffled up a Decree about them, the last day of their Session, (*n*) in which Decree they acknowledge, *Such abuses in them, that give the Hereticks* (as they call us) *occasion to blaspheme them; and they acknowledge such wicked gains in the sale of them, that is very much a cause of abusing Christian People; and they acknowledge also other abuses, through Superstition, Ignorance, Irreverence, and otherwise, which they referre to be reformed by the Pope, who they say hath alone power to dispense them.* And to give us a demonstration what we may expect for the reforming of the Abuses of them, themselves break the Law the same day they made it; Cardinal (*o*) *Morone* as chief President, granted to every one that was present in the Session, or had assisted in the Council, a plenary Indulgence; when they had but then decreed, that the sole dispensing of them belongs to the Pope. But I'le say no more to the History of Indulgences.

m *History of the Council of Trent. l.8 p.801*

n *Concil. Bin. Edit. Tom.9. p.433.*

o *Hist. of the Council, p.813.*

Thirdly, The next thing I am to shew you, is, the *Contradictions* of them; and herein I shall take *Bellarmine* for their Oracle, and give you a gleaning of Contradictions in five things he saith about Indulgences. *viz.* To an Authentical Indulgence, there must be, (*p*) 1. *Authority* in the Giving. 2. *Piety* in the Cause. 3. A State of *Grace* in the Receiver. 4. The *thing* pardoned is, not the Fault but the *Punishment*. 5. The *Punishment* pardoned, is neither Natural, nor those that are inflicted in any outward Court that is contentious, whether Ecclesiastical or Secular. Now do but observe some few (of many) gross Contradictions about all these, *e. g.*

p *Bellarm. de Indulg. l.1. c.11. & c.7.*

1. As to the *Authority* of granting Indulgences: He saith, that Christ in giving the Keyes to *Peter* and the rest of the Apostles, gave to them the Power of *Order*, and to *Peter* the Power of *Jurisdiction*; so that the Pope holds from *Peter* a peculiar Power of Jurisdiction; every ordinary Priest may pardon Sin, deliver the Soul from Hell, but he cannot discharge them from *temporal* Satisfactions. How many Contradictions there are in this, I cannot say, but pray take notice of these.

First, The Keyes were given *equally* to *all* the Apostles, therefore not so to *Peter*; I question not but this hath been evidenced to you in a former Exercise.

Secondly, What a Contradiction is it to say, the Pope cannot pardon the Penance enjoyned by a Priest, and yet can pardon what is required by

by God? *i.e.* he cannot take off the ſentence of an Inferiour Court, but he can take off the ſentence of a Superiour: As if a man ſhould ſay among us, A Juſtice of the Peace cannot diſcharge a man from the Stocks, that is ſet there by a Conſtable, but he can give a man a Pardon for his Life, that is condemned by the Judge. Whereas this is obvious to all, that no inferiour Judge can take off the Sentence of a Superiour. What will not theſe men dare do, that dare cry up the Pope to be Superiour to God himſelf?

2. As to *Piety* in the Cauſe. The pretended Cauſes are ſuch as theſe: *viz.* The Building of Churches, the endowing of Hoſpitals, the making of Bridges, the Warring againſt Infidels or Hereticks, or ſome other Acts of Charity.

Firſt, This contradicts the Scripture-Conditions for Pardon of Sins; but what care they for Scripture?

Secondly, Where's Piety in the Cauſe, (*q*) when the Pope upon the day of his Coronation, ſitting upon a Throne ſet upon the top of the ſtairs of St. *Peters* Church, throws Indulgences among the people, as one would throw a handfull of Farthings among a Company of Beggars, to ſcramble for them, catch as catch can? But do they ſay, that *piety* is in the Cauſe? the real Cauſe is to get Money. I know *Bellarmine* is very angry with us, for charging this upon them; but let them anſwer their own Authors in this matter. *Matth. Pariſienſ.* tells us, that when ſeveral were drawn in, under *Innocent* the fourth, unto the Holy Warre, the Pope compell'd them to redeem their Vows: (*r*) *Leo* the tenth, gave out Indulgences for the repayring of St. *Peters* Church, whereas *Julius* his predeceſſor left an infinite Treaſure to that end, and the Money gathered by Indulgences was laid out about the Palace of the *Medici* in *Florence*, much of it diſtributed among the Cardinals and his Minions; and the Indulgences of *Saxony*, (*s*) he gave unto his Siſter *Magdalene*, wife unto *Franceſchetto Cibo* Baſtard Son of *Innocent* the 8th; by reaſon of which Marriage this *Leo* was created Cardinal at the Age of Fourteen years. But what need I mention particulars? See but the *Taxa Cancellariæ Apoſtolicæ*, and there you have the ſeveral ſummes ſet upon the ſeveral ſins; I'le name ſome few, (*t*) *viz.* *For the carnal knowledge of his Mother, Siſter, or other Kinſwoman by Blood or Marriage*, or *his God mother, five Groſſu's* (*Groſſus* is neer about a Groat of our Money, but I'le reckon it high enough) *five Six-pences. For the deflowring of a Virgin* (6 *groſſ.*) *ſix Sixpences. For Perjury*, (6 *gr.*) *ſix Six-pences. For a Woman that drinks any Potion, or doth any other act to deſtroy her live-child within her*, (5 *gr.*) *five Six-pences. For him that kills his Father, Mother, Brother, Siſter, Wife*, (*D. 1. carl. 5.*) *one Crown and five Groats.* And in the Table for diſpenſing about Marriages, when the Rates are ſtated for the firſt and ſecond degree, there is added, *Note diligently, that Favours, and Diſpenſations of this kind are not to be granted to the Poor*; and the Reaſon is given, *becauſe they are*

q *Moulin. Novelty of Popery*, p. 465.

r *Review of the Council of Trent*, p. 91, 92

s *Hiſtor. of the Counc. of Trent.* p. 5.

t *Taxa Cancel. Apoſt. fol.* 36, 37, 38, 41.

are not (i. e. not capable of paying for them) *therefore they cannot be comforted.* *Voetius* (*u*) tells us, That the Papists he convers'd with, deny that ever there was any such thing, or any such Book, and say, we slander them: Whereas *Espenceus* † tells us, that it was openly sold, and he tells us so with this Remarque: *'Tis a wonder, that at this time, in this Schisme, that such an infamous Index of such filthy and to be abhorred wickednes is not suppres'd,* ('twas printed at *Paris*, in the year 1520.) *there's neither in* Germany, Switzerland, *nor in any other place where there's a Defection from the* Roman *See, a Book more to their Reproach; and yet* (saith he) *it is not supres'd by the Favourers of the Church of* Rome, *it teacheth and encourageth to such wickednes, as we may be afraid to hear named, and a price is set to all Buyers.* Is not this enough to shew the *piety* of them?

u Voet. Selec. Disp. part. 2. p. 296.

† Espencæus in Titum. c. 1. digr. 2. p. 479.

3. The third requisite is, The Receiver of Indulgence must be in the State of *Grace*. 'Tis ordinarily said, they must be *confes's'd*, and *contrite*, though others deny the necessity of it; every way here's a swarm of Contradictions. I'le name one or two.

First, They deny, that any one can know, whether he be in a state of Grace or not: pray unriddle me this; The Decree about Indulgences saith, that Indulgences are very profitable to Christian people, and damns those that say otherwise: And the same (*x*) Council damns those that shall so far own their Christianity as to affirm their Faith to be certainly *saving*. But I'le quit this, and request you to consider the next.

x Concil. General. & Provincial. Bin. Edit. Tom. 9. p. 362. conc. Trid. Sess. 6. can. 15, 16, 23. &c.

Secondly, Whether is there any infallible Evidence of a Persons not being in a state of *Grace?* if there be, what is it? Will the living and dying in all manner of *mortal* sins, such as Blasphemy, Witchcraft, Murder, Incest, Adultery, Perjury, reckon up all the wickedness that you can in the World, will these speak a man to be Graceless? Indulgences provide for a full pardon of all these sins: The stationary Indulgences of the City of *Rome*, that is, the Indulgences annexed to every Church, granted to those that visit them, amount to a Million of Years, (to gratifie *Bellarmine* for telling me why they grant so many, I will not make any Observations upon *Gregories* Dedication of the Church of *Lateran*, (*y*) when he gave as many dayes of Indulgence, as there fall drops of Rain, when it rains without ceasing for the space of three Dayes and three Nights; and when *Gregory* feared, lest the Treasury of Grace would be emptyed by that profuseness, Christ appeared unto him, and told him, He was willing he should grant more Indulgences, for the people had need of them; but I will take *Bellarmine's* word, that he hath not read this in any Author he likes, and for the reason beforesaid I'le let it goe.) I might reckon up an innumerable company more in several places: But now why so many years? a man can do Penance in this World no longer than he lives, and their Purgatory they say lasts no longer than the Day of Judgement; what use is there then of so many millions

y Chemnit. Exam. p. 739.

millions of years of Indulgence? *Bellarmine* (I thank him) tells me, (z) "We cannot deny, but that some are bound by the Penitential Ca- "nons to some thousands of years penance; for if to every deadly sin "there be due by the Canons so many years Penance, as to some three, "to some seven, *&c.* then he that hath accustomed himself to Perjury "and Blasphemy almost every moment, and most frequently commits "Murders, Thefts, Sacriledges, Adulteries, *without doubt the Popes had respect to such as these, when they gave Indulgences for ten or twenty thousand years.* So then, if they commit all the sins before mentioned so often, that the Penance due for them would amount to millions of years, yet they need fear nothing, they are provided of Indulgences, they shall go to Heaven as sure as the Pope has the Key of it. Well, let's lay these things a little together: He tells us, Those that receive benefit by Indulgences, must be in the state of Grace; and he also tells us, that without doubt the Pope had respect (great kindness certainly) for those that accustome themselves to Perjury and Blasphemy almost every moment, and most frequently commit Murders, Thefts, Sacriledges, Adulteries, *&c.* Now then, either Indulgences profit those that are not in a state of Grace, or these Belialists pass for Saints with their infallible Judge; either of which is an abominable contradiction.

z. *Bell. de Indulg. l. 1. c. 9.* p. 25.

4. As to *what* is pardoned by Indulgences. He saith, the *Fault* is never pardoned, but the temporary *Punishment*. Here I have two Questions to ask, and one Story to tell, and all from themselves.

First, What mean those Clauses usual in Indulgences, of pardon of *Fault* and *Punishment?*

Secondly, What say they to *Venial* sins, they are Faults, and there they grant both Fault and Punishment, are pardoned. But to let these pass, I le give a story that smells rank, out of St. *Francis* his Conformities, (a *Folio* stuffed with as prodigious Lies as ever Paper was stained with,) among other Whiskers take this about Indulgences: (*a*) "While "blessed *Francis* stood in his Cell at St. *Mary's de Portiuncula*, and "most fervently prayed to God for Sinners, there appeared an Angel "of the Lord unto him, who bade him go to the Church, for there Christ, "and blessed *Mary*, with a great multitude of Angels expected him; "he presently went, who when he saw Christ with his Mother standing "at his right hand, and a great multitude of Angels, he fell upon his "face for Fear and Reverence, and then our Lord Jesus Christ said to "him, as he lay prostrate before him and his Mother, *Francis*, thou "and thy Companions are much solicitous for the salvation of Souls; Ask "what thou wilt about the Salvation of Nations, and the Comfort of "Souls, and the Honour and Reverence of God, because thou art given "for a Light to the Nations, and a Reparation of the Church: And he "lay a while as rapt up in the sight of God, but at length when he "came to himself, he begg'd Indulgence for all and every one that came "to that place, that entered into that Church, of all their sins universally

a *Liber conform. vit. B. & Seraph. Pat. Francisci ad vitam* I. C. D. N. *impr. Bonon.* 1590. p. 198, 199.

"and

"and generally of all their sins, of which they had made Confession to "the Priest, and received his Command; and he besought his blessed "Mother the *Advocate of Mankind*, to intercede for the Grant of this: "The most blessed and most humble *Queen of Heaven* being moved "with the Prayers of blessed *Francis*, presently began to supplicate her "Son, telling him, it became him to have regard unto the Prayers of "blessed *Francis* his Servant. His Divine Majesty, presently said, It is "a very great thing thou hast asked, but Brother *Francis* thou art wor-"thy of greater things, and thou shalt have greater things, but I will "that thou go to my Vicar, to whom I have given power of binding "and loosing in Heaven and in Earth, and from me, ask of him this In-"dulgence. Whereupon he took his Companion Brother *Massæus*, and "went to Pope *Honorius*, and told him, that he had repaired a Church "to the Honour of the blessed Virgin, and he desired that he would "grant Indulgence there, without Offerings, who answered, *that can-"not conveniently be done, for he that receives Indulgence, must put to "his helping hand*; but tell me, (saith he) how many years Indulgence "wouldst thou have? He answered, I will, that whosoever comes to "this Church, confess'd, and contrite, and absolved by the Priest as he "ought, that he be absolved from Fault and Punishment from the day of "his Baptism, unto the day and hour of his entring into the Church afore-"said, and I ask it in the behalf of Christ who sent me to thee: The "Pope said three times publickly, It pleaseth me that thou have it,----- "So blessed *Francis* bowed his head, and went out; which when the "Pope saw, he called, O Simpleton, whither goest thou? what dost "thou carry away of this Indulgence? *Francis* answered, your word is "enough---- I'le have no other Instrument, let Blessed *Mary be the Paper*, "Christ the Notary, and Angels the witnesses, *&c.*---- Miracles are re-lated by the Dozen to confirm this Indulgence, I'le mention but one: "Upon the day of Indulgence, (the first of *August*) Brother *Corradus* "saw the Blessed Virgin with her Child in her Arms, and the sweet Babe, "* did without intermission, with his own hands bless all the People "that were out of Devotion present, and imparted to them his Grace. Well, you see here, both Fault and Punishment pardoned by Indulgen-ces, and yet Indulgences can onely pardon the Punishment: Reconcile these.

* *Is he a child still?*

5. A fifth (and the last thing) I shall name, of what is fruitfull of Con-tradictions is, the *kind* of Punishments that are pardoned by Indulgen-ces; *Bellarmine* saith, they are neither Natural, nor those that are in-flicted by any contentious Court, whether Civil or Ecclesiastical.

If this be so, then there's nothing forgiven, for (*b*) what sufferings more are there to be pardoned, but those that are Natural or impos'd? If any more were due for sins, without doubt God would inflict them upon the Damned; But God inflicts no other upon them, Therefore, *&c.* But *Bellarmine* tells us, they are those Punishments that are inflicted in

b *Thes. Salm. part. 2. p. 77. n. 11. &c.*

the

the Penitentiary Court, which we voluntarily fulfill, to which we are no way compelled, but by the Fear of God, and the ſtingings of our Conſcience. Pray who gives the Prieſt power to inflict any puniſhment upon thoſe whoſe ſins are pardoned? But if we are bound in Conſcience, and in the Fear of God to perform them, how dare the Pope releaſe them? But pray let's again conſider, what are the Puniſhments uſually inflicted? They are Prayers, and Alms, and Faſting. Muſt not that be a famous Church think you, where Faſting and Prayer are Puniſhments, and as it were layd in the ballance with the pains of Purgatory, which pains are as grievous as the torments of Hell, bating the Duration? Let them never boaſt more of their Devotion nor Charity; they are with them Penalties, with us Priviledges; we are ſo far from giving any thing to be excuſed theſe Duties, that we would not be hired out of the performance of them: Should any of our Miniſters but preach ſuch Diſpenſations, we ſhould account them the Devils Apoſtles, (*c*) *deceitfull workers.* What! teach men how to ſell themſelves to work wickedneſs, and then how to purchaſe Heaven with their wages of unrighteouſneſs! O my Soul enter not into their ſecret. But in ſhort, we underſtand neither the Grammar nor the Divinity of pardoning, (*d*) of Repentance, who think there's nothing but Sin or Puniſhment that needs a Pardon. And thus I have ſhewed you ſome of their *Contradictions.* The next thing I promiſed to ſpeak to, was their *Cheats*, and I may well be briefer here, for what is all that hath been ſpoken of, but a grand Cheat?

c 2 Cor. 11.13.

d *Chamier.* Panſt. Tom. 3. l. 24. c. 15. Sect. 15.

Fourthly, The *Cheats* of Indulgences will be Notorious, bring them but forth into the Light, and every one may diſcern them. I need produce but a pattern, for they are all of a piece.

How ſhall a man be ſure he is not cheated of his Money, when he cannot know what he buyes? And how can a man know what he buyes, when they are not agreed among themſelves what they ſell? (*e*) *e. g.* They are not yet agreed, whether an Indulgence be a Judiciary abſolution, or a payment of the Debt by way of Compenſation of Puniſhment out of the Treaſury, or both, (I may adde, or neither, e're I have done with this particular;) Could they get over this, here's another difficulty in the way, *viz.* What Bond is looſed by Indulgence, *i. e.* what ſins, what Puniſhments are we any way freed from? though *Bellarmine* (as you have heard) ſay, Without doubt the Popes had reſpect to the worſt of men, yet he himſelf elſewhere ſaith, (*f*) *That we are neither abſolv'd nor ſolv'd from the Guilt of any fault whether Mortal or Venial, by Indulgences.* Among ſeveral Reaſons given, (*g*) I'le name but one: As a dead member receives not Influence from the other Members of the Body that are living, ſo he that is in *mortal ſin*, is as a dead Member, and receives not Indulgence from the Merits of living Members. I know *Bellarmine* ſaith, (*h*) *The Saints cannot merit for others, but they may ſatisfie for others, there being in the Actions of the Righteous a double Value, namely, of Merit and Satisfaction*; (though the Diſtinction is every way a Nullity, there being neither Merit nor Satisfaction, but let

e *Bell.* de Indulg. l. 1. c. 5. p. 19.

f Idem c. 7. p. 21.

g *Raynerii* Pantheolog. Tom. 1. p. 1146.

h *Bell.* de Ind. l. 1. c. 2

that pass for the present;) Without controversie (saith he,) one mans Merit cannot be applyed to another: yet by his favour, *Hadrian*, though he speaks less than *Bellarmine* in other things, he speaks more in this; for he saith, (*i*) He that is in *mortal sin* himself, may merit for another, *&c.* He calls *paying* for the Indulgence, *meriting* of it; and I think well he may, for his Money is well worth it. I might adde, they are not yet agreed what is meant by (*k*) *a Years Pardon*, whether 360 dayes of Penance, or onely all the Fasting dayes in the Year. If the former, what s meant by that usual Clause in Indulgences for so many Years, and so many *Quarentines*, or Forty dayes of Penance, besides those that are contained in the general account of the Year? They are not yet agreed about the Value and Efficacy of Indulgences, whether they are worth what they pretend, or not: Some do not stick to say, their holy Father may do by his Children, as a mother by hers, that promiseth her Child an Apple if he will do such a thing, but when he hath done it, she doth not give it. Neither are they yet agreed, whether they may not be effectual, though the Condition of them be not performed. But why do I enquire into those things that will not bear a Scrutiny? I have said enough to evidence, that neither Seller nor Buyer understand the Ware of their Market; and these two things more may be enough to prove them a *Cheat*.

i *Hadrian* 6 Quest. de Sacram. in 4. lib. sent. fol. 163.

k Idem fol. 162.

I. When *Bellarmine* (*l*) saith, They are all agreed, that an Indulgence is not valid, unless the Cause be Just; and he names several things must concurre to make it just; but concludes, it belongs not to the Popes Subjects to judge, whether the Cause be just or unjust; they ought simply to account it just: And instanceth, how the Pope may grant the *greatest* Indulgences, upon the *lightest* Cause: *e.g.* When a plenary Indulgence is granted to all those that stand before the Doors of St. *Peters* Church, while the Pope upon *Easter-day* solemnly blesseth the People. We count this Condition ridiculous: *O no* (saith he elsewhere) *they thereby shew their obedience to the Pope.* Is that it? Mark this I pray you: By this Doctrine, a man may live in Disobedience and Rebellion against God all his dayes, and at last so far obey the Pope, as to go see a fine Shew, without parting with any one sin, and he shall be saved. Who but those that are *given* (*m*) *up to strong delusions to believe a lye*, can believe this?

l Bel'arm. de Indulg. l. 1. c. 12. p. 28, 29.

m 2 Thes. 2. 11. 12.

II. Neither those that grant, nor those that receive, nor those that plead for Indulgences, dare themselves *trust* to them; witness the solemn Services performed for them after their death, yea for the Pope himself. Now those that plead for the validity of plenary Indulgences, when they are ask'd, What need then of Funeral Obsequies? they answer, Some sins may be forgotten, *&c.* What! and yet the deceased hath had their *full*, their *plenary*, and their *most full* Indulgences! What these mean, take from one of their infallible Oracles, *Hadrian* the sixth, in his Book that was printed at *Rome* in the very time of his Papacy, and so this is as it were out of the Chair: He (*n*) tells us, that a Full Indulgence

n *Hadrian* ibid. 163.

dulgence respects Penance injoyned for *mortal* sins; a Plenary Indulgence respects *Penance* injoyned for *mortal* and *venial* sins; and a Most Full Indulgence respects the *Penance* that might have been injoyned for *mortal* and *venial* sins. *Tollet* almost a hundred years after, gives us a little more light into that gradation of Indulgences, and tells us, (*o*) That a Full Indulgence respects the Remission of the *Punishment* injoyned; a Fuller Indulgence respects that *Punishment* that might have been injoyned according to the Canons; the Fullest respects that *Punishment* which may be required by the Divine Judgement. Now then, if Indulgences pardon all manner of sins, *mortal* and *venial*, all manner of Repentance that God or Man can require, and all manner of *Punishment* that God or Man can inflict, and yet those that receive these Indulgences, when they are dead, need the same means for *Pardon*, that those do that never had any Indulgences; doth not this evidence, that the chief Patrons of Indulgences do in their own Consciences believe them to be a Cheat? I shall next shew you how *they are injurious to Christ.*

o *Tollet.* Instruc. Sacerd. lib. 6. cap. 24. p. 676.

Fifthly, Indulgences are *injurious* to Christ, and which is to me considerable, they *are most injurious to Christ*, where they *seem most to honour him*; what they speak of Christ with the greatest reverence, is at the bottom full of falshood, injustice, and blasphemy. *e.g.* They say, *One drop* of the Blood of Christ was enough to redeem the World: Doth not this Assertion put an inestimable value upon the Blood of Christ? Examine it a little, and you will find, that *Judas*-like, they betray him with a Kiss: For,

1. This takes (*p*) away the Necessity of Christs Death, which the Scripture doth so often inculcate. What need the Son of God undergo such a painfull, ignominious, and cursed Death, if *one drop* of his Blood was sufficient? How can we believe that the Father, who delighteth not in the death of a sinner, would delight in the cruel and cursed Death of his most innocent, onely begotten Son, if it were not necessary for our Redemption? Can we think that God, who will not punish his damned Enemies beyond what they deserve, would exact a punishment of his Son so much more than there was need? Is the Death of Christ superfluous? I dare not say of the Captain of our Salvation, as *David* said of the Captain of the Host of *Israel*, *Dyed Abner as a Fool died?* No, Death was the Debt, and such a Debt must be the Payment, as may pay the Debt, and that by the Sinner, or (through Grace) by his Surety.

p *Thes. Salm.* part. 2. p. 71. &c.

2. If *one drop* of the Blood of Christ be sufficient, and all the rest to be layd up in a Treasury, and the Satisfactions of Saints likewise added; then there needs more to redeem us from Temporal *Punishments*, than from Eternal wrath, and Christ is not a compleat Saviour; than which nothing is more absurd in it self, nor more reproachfull to Christ: To prove this, 'tis easie to multiply Scriptures, but to produce their own Authors, at present I'le name but one, who expressely tells us (*q*) *That it is onely Christ, with the Father, and the Holy Ghost, that can with plenary Authority grant all manner of Indulgence from Fault and Punishment.*

q *Cursor.* Tom. 1. Opusc. de Indulg. fol. 191. confid. 5. 8.

niſhment.---- and it is Chriſt alone that can grant ſo many thouſand thouſand years of Pardon, as we find in ſome Popes Grants; for no Temporal Puniſhment can endure the thouſandth part of that time.

Sixthly, Indulgences are abominably *injurious* to *Souls*: They came in upon the declining of *piety*, and they (*r*) are the product of the later and worſer times. The plain truth is, Indulgences do in the Nature of the thing promote wickedneſs, for 'tis onely wicked men that need Indulgences; thoſe that they account Saints, do ſo much more than they need, that their ſuperfluous good Works conſtitute a Treaſury for others: Sure then we may reckon, that their midling ſort, though they have no Satisfactions to ſpare, yet they have ſo many, they need not be beholding to others; ſo that 'tis onely the worſt of men that need Indulgence, and what can (*s*) "More oblige them to redouble their Crimes, "and miſdemeanours, to abandon themſelves to all manner of vice and "lewdneſs, than to be ſure, that all the ſins they can commit ſhall be for-"given them? yea, to have them pardoned before-hand, in having In-"dulgences for ſins already committed, and to be committed; with this "expreſs Clauſe [*be they never ſo heynous,*]? *Marcus Antonius de Dominis* may (*t*) well ſay, That *Indulgences are one of the great Secrets of the Papacy, they are famous Gold-mines, out of which a great power of Gold hath been digged for the Apoſtolical See,---- but they have utterly baniſhed true Repentance from the Popiſh Churches.* *Navarrus* goeth further, (if I may credit *P. D. Moulin*'s (*u*) quotation of him, I having not the Book by me,) for although he was the Popes Penitentiary, yet when he writ for Indulgences, he could not abſtain from ſaying, *The Grant of them is odious, becauſe the Collectors ſeek not the good of Souls, but the Profit of Money*, &c. In ſhort, what wicked man is there that gives any credit to their Doctrine of Indulgences, but will gratifie his Luſts, that he may have the pleaſures of both Worlds? For according to that Doctrine, *There's none but Fools and Friendleſs can miſs of Heaven.* But enough, enough, and more than enough, of this miſchievous Doctrine.

r *Forbs* Inſtruct. Hiſtor. theol. lib. 12. c. 8. p. 655.

s Review. lib. 5. c. 1. p. 250.

t de Rep. Eccleſ. 5. c. 8. n. 13. p. 240.

u Novelty of Popery. lib. 7. c. 2. p. 467.

Let's therefore in the laſt place, trye whether it is poſſible to make any good Uſe of ſo bad a Doctrine.

Uſe 1. Let them henceforth be *aſhamed* of their abſurd Reproaches of the *Reformed Churches*, as if they were not *pure* enough, or *ſtrict* enough for them: What Doctrines have we, that the Devil himſelf can charge us with, like theirs of *Indulgences?* Thoſe dayes are paſt with them, wherein 'twas *harder for a* * *rich man to enter into the Kingdome of Heaven, than for a Camel to go through the eye of a Needle*; for now thoſe need never doubt of Salvation: 'tis for ſuch dull Souls as we are, to harp upon ſuch harſh ſtrings as theſe; (*x*) *They that truſt in their wealth, and boaſt themſelves in the multitude of their riches; none of them can by any means redeem his brother, nor give to God a ranſome for him; for the redemption of their Soul is precious, and it ceaſeth for ever*, &c. And that other word of Chriſt, *What is a man profited, if he*

* Mat. 19. 24.

x Pſ. 49. 6, 7, 8. & Mat. 16. 26.

ſhall

ſhall gain the whole World, and loſe his own Soul? or what ſhall a man give in exchange for his Soul? We dare not anſwer theſe Scriptures with that Interpretation of *Prov.* 13.8. which he doth that gloſſeth upon *Gerſon*, in the forecited place, *The ranſom of a mans life are his riches*; as if a man need do no more but purchaſe an Indulgence, and all is well. We like the Apoſtles counſel better, (*y*) *Let every man prove his own work, and then ſhall he have rejoycing in himſelf, and not in another*; and that for the very reaſon which the Apoſtle gives, *For every man ſhall bear his own burden.* We are neither to be *proud* of being better than others, nor *truſt* to ſhare Benefits with thoſe that are better than us: (*z*) The Wiſe Virgins had no Oyl to ſpare, when the Fooliſh had their Oyl to ſeek. We bleſs God, that we have a Chriſt to truſt to, and not any that may, like (*a*) *Hermannus*, be many years woſhipped for a Saint, and then his bones dug up, and burnt for an Heretick, by that very *Boniface* who appointed the firſt Jubile, and that with a ſingular reſpect to the viſiting the Sepulchers of the Saints: Commend which you will, whether his worſhipping or his burning of the Bones of any they call Saints, we think he might well have acknowledged with (*b*) *Eugenius*, *That what key he had of opening and ſhutting, through his folly he did not prudently make uſe of it.* Our common people can read in their Bibles, that they are (*c*) *Fools* which *make a mock of ſin*, playing with it both in the Commiſſion and Expiation: but we dare not do ſo: we dare not play the Mountebanks in Religion, to make ſome whiffling about the Conſcience, and then ſtupifie it with a Cheat: We ingenuouſly confeſs, we have not better eſteem of Indulgences, than had the Citizens of *Prague*, (*d*) who put the Indulgent-Merchant into the ſame Cart with ſome common Whores, about whoſe breaſts they hung the Papal Indulgences, and ſo drew him and the Whores with the Indulgences hanging about their necks, expoſing them to ſcorn through every ſtreet of the City; and then took the Bulls of Indulgences, and publickly and ſolemnly burnt them. Such honour may they meet with wherever they come.

Uſe 2. I'le no longer forbear acquainting you with that by way of Uſe, which you might well expect in the opening of the Doctrine, *viz.* To ſtate, how far God may be ſaid to puniſh ſin after he hath pardoned it. We deny not but thoſe whoſe ſins are pardoned, meet with many bitter Calamities in this world, but the queſtion between the Papiſts and us is, Whether they are puniſhments of ſin (*e*) properly ſo called; we grant they are *materially* Puniſhments, but not *formally*; *i. e.* the ſame things when ſuffered by wicked men are *puniſhments*, but to them they are onely *fatherly chaſtiſements*, not *judicial puniſhments*; *wholſom Medicines*, not *Penal Executions*? *e. g.* A Malefactor hath his hand cut off for ſtriking in a Court of Judicature, that's *properly* a puniſhment; an innocent Perſon hath his hand cut off, becauſe 'tis gangren'd, that's not a *puniſhment* but a *kindneſs*. Plainly, a *puniſhment* is properly to ſatisfie Revenging Juſtice, a Judge (as ſuch) hath no reſpect to the Offenders repentance; but God alwayes (*f*) chaſtiſeth *for our profit, that we might be partakers of his holineſs.* We deny not but

y Gal. 6. 4, 5.

z Mat. 25. 8, 9.

a *Platina de vit. Bonifac.* 8. p. 247.

b *L. Bp.* Tom. 15. p. 614. Eugenii Pontif. Hildegard.

c Prov. 14. 9.

d *Chemn. exam.* p. 741.

e *Dallæus de pœn. & ſatisfac. lib.* 1. c. 2. p. 4. 5. & ſeqq. ſparſim.

f Heb. 12. 10.

g *Rhem. Catb. Orth. Tom. 2. Tract. 3. qu. 13. p. 63.*

but God chastiseth for sin, but the question between the [g] Papists and us, is not about the *impulsive* Cause, but the *final, i. e.* Whether God in punishing his Children, do it to satisfie his Justice with another satisfaction besides that he hath received by the death of his Son. The shortest and the plainest Answer to this Question, will be to clear up those Scriptures which they

h 2 Sam. 12. 14

press into their service. They urge *David*'s case, (*h*) *Because by this deed thou hast given great occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme, the child---- shall surely dye.* We grant, that because of *Davids* sin, his Child dyed, but we deny 'twas *properly* a *Punishment*. *Nathan* makes a plain difference between the punishment due to *David* for the sin which is par-

i--ver. 13.

doned, (*the Lord hath put away thy sin, thou shalt not die,*) and the Discipline, whereby he would take off the scandal of wicked men; God as it were put off the person of a Judge, and assumed the person of a Father. Whereas they say, *David* prayed against it, and therefore 'twas a *Punishment*; the answer is easie: The sick man begs of his Physitian, that he may have no more nauseous physick, no more corroding Plaisters, *&c.* are his Medicines therefore *punishments?* God would cure *David*, and prevent others from taking encouragement to sin by his Example; to this end God makes use of dreadfull Physick, yet 'tis but physick. The like may be said

k Numb. 12. 14

to *Miriams* case, who was struck with Leprosie, [k] God would have her to be ashamed, and repent of her molesting his Servants in the discharge of their duty. But there are other instances of *pardoned persons*, struck with Death for their Offences, of whom they jeeringly ask us, *Did God strike them dead that they might mend their Lives?* e. g. *Moses* and *Aaron*, to

l Numb. 20. 24.

whom God said, '*Ye shall not enter into the land which I have given unto the children of Israel, because ye have rebelled against my Word*, &c. I answer, their death was not *properly* a *Punishment*, but matter of Instruction to other Believers; There's a singular Mystery in *Moses* his death, to teach, that the Law brings not into the Heavenly *Canaan*, that must be done by Christ: That of the Old Prophet, to whom the very person that deceived

m 1 King. 13. 21, 22, 24.

him said from God, [m] *Forasmuch as thou hast disobeyed the mouth of the Lord---- thy Carkase shall not come unto the Sepulchre of thy Fathers; and when he was gone, a Lion met him by the way, and slew him:* God by the Threatning brought him to Repentance, and by his Death warns us to take heed how we swerve, though never so little, from his Command: There was his own Amendment to Salvation, and the Profit of the Church by so memorable a Monument of Gods severity. But what need I spend time in particular Instances, while the Scripture speaks of Believers in general, that Death is to them a Priviledge, not a Punishment? And Death

* 1 Cor. 3. 22.

† Phil. 1. 21.

† 1 Cor. 15. 55.

it self is * inventoryed among their Treasures, that whenever or however it seizeth upon them, 'twill be their Gain, † and matter of Triumph. † In a word therefore, this dear Christians would I charge upon you, Above all things secure your Reconciliation with God, and then practically learn to answer Gods Ends in all your Chastisements and Tryals; set your selves to hate Sin, to be exemplary in Holiness, to live in the continual exercise and growth of Grace, till God translate you to glory.

3. Thirdly,

3. Thirdly, let's bleſs God for being delivered from the deviliſh Deluſions of that Religion. *Religion* did I call it? how do they forfeit the the very Name, while they induſtriouſly ſtrive to make men *Atheiſts*, that they may make them *Papiſts?* and what bait can be more alluring, than that they can afford them Indulgence at ſo cheap a rate? Their Seraphical Doctor tells us of ſome [n] Indulgences granted to help to build ſome Church, or the like, thoſe that gave a peny towards it, ſhould be pardoned the third part of their Repentance, and for another peny another third part, and for another peny the laſt third part; ſo that for 3 *d.* for three half pence, ſaith † *Altiſſiodorenſis*; and among other proofs for the value of Indulgences he brings this, That the Head of *John* the Baptiſt was given to the Damoſel, by which Damoſel is meant the Church of the *Gentiles*; ſo that the Church of the *Gentiles* hath the Head of *John*, i. e. the Head of Grace, therefore ſhe may grant Indulgence to her Subjects: A profound demonſtration. So that he may be diſcharged from the troubleſom work of Repentance; this the Seraphical Doctor thinks to be falſe and ridiculous, and therefore he thus reſolves the value of Indulgences: In reſpect of him that grants them, they are of as much value as he ſayes they are; but in reſpect of him that receives them, they are of more or leſs value, according as he is diſpoſed: So then, if they are fit for none, they are worth nothing. *Angles* † reckons up ſix other Opinions, but all ſuch as will rather torment than ſatisfie an awakened Conſcience. Oh! what a miſerable plunge muſt that Soul be in, that truſting to Indulgences, commits Sin with greedineſs, and never conſidering till he comes to die, he findes too late, that the largeſt Indulgences are onely valuable according to the diſpoſition of the Receiver, and ſo he that moſt needs them, ſhall have leaſt benefit by them. Some of the very Popes themſelves have been aſhamed of theſe Cheats, and would have recalled them, but his Kindred oppoſed it, with the ſame Argument that *Demetrius* did *Paul*, [p] *By this Craft we have our wealth.* In ſhort, though they tell us, that Pope *Gregory* delivered *Trajan* out of Hell, yet we dare truſt to none but Chriſt, to *deliver us from the wrath to come*, and we bleſs God that we have no other to truſt to. We had rather now cry to God for Mercy, than too late cry out in our Miſery, [q] *Good God upon what a frail Spiders Web doth hang the vaſt weight of Papal Omnipotency!* Now we feel with a vengeance the Pope is not infallible. But I'le cloſe all with what may be more profitable, than ſuch fruitleſs complaints.

[n] *Bonavent. in Sent. Venet. Edit. Tom. 4. p. 323.*

† *Altiſſiod. in Sent. l. 4. tract. 6. c. 9. fol. 40.*

† *Angles in quartum Sent. part. 2 quæſt. de Indulg. p. 1415.*

[o] *Platina de vit. Bonifac. 9. p. 275.*

[p] Act. 19. 25.

[q] *Mar. Ant. de Dom. ibid. p. 245. n. 28.*

4ly. In the laſt place therefore, I would ſeriouſly caution you againſt that Mock-Religion, which is little elſe than an Engine of carnal Intereſt. As you love your Souls, take heed of all ſinfull tendencies, of either Head, Heart or Life, towards thoſe pernicious Doctrines, of which this is one of the chief. I freely confeſs, I ſee no cauſe of fear, (the Lord keep us from all confidence in any ſtrength of our own,) that ever that Religion ſhall reign in the Conſciences of thoſe that have been once delivered from it; but 'tis an eaſie matter to perſwade thoſe that are of no Religion, to be of that Religion. How many are there that walk in darkneſs in this Noon-day light? and 'tis an eaſie proceſs from Ignorance to Errour, and to be devout too in that Religion where Ignorance is the Mother of it. How many are there, that will rather part with Heaven than with their Luſts? an eaſie temptation muſt needs proſelyte them to that Religion that promiſeth

miseth infallibly to secure both. In short, Indulgences are the softest Arguments for delicate sinners, and the Inquisition the most cogent Argument for the refractory: To prevent therefore the Charms of the one, and to establish against the knocking Argument of the other, I shall only commend these two things to you.

† *Aug.* de Civit. Dei l. 21. c. 27. p. 664.

First, Do not make light of Sin, and you can never be a Friend to Indulgences; † *Augustine* speaks like himself, when he saith, *'Tis most difficult to find out, and most dangerous to define what sins they are for which we may have Indulgence by the Merits of the Saints our Friends*; he professeth, *He could not by his search come to the knowledge of them*; and the Lesson he would learn and teach from it, was this, *To avoyd all sin, and not at all to trust to the Merits of others.* We may cry out concerning this Doctrine, *Without controversie great is the Mystery of Ungodliness!* I grant there is a great controversie betwen them and us about it, but yet when I consider, that I do not find two of them of a mind, but that they every one charge one another with something faulty in their particular Sentiments about them; and their darling Council, before they made the Decree about them, [r] censured all the Money-gatherers upon them, to be Incorrigible, and that they had no hopes of their amendment; I need not fear to say, *Without controversie great is the Mystery of Ungodliness.* For one who is himself guilty of *mortal* sin, [s] at his pleasure to grant to as many as he please, guilty [t] of the most prodigious villanies, as large Indulgences as they can desire, if this be not to encourage and propagate wickedness, what is? I would therefore commend this to you, Look upon Sin to be not onely the greatest, but *The onely Evil*, and that not so much as [u] the least can be pardoned without the Blood of Christ; and that as ever you expect benefit by † Christ, you must *depart from Iniquity*, and that whosoever saith, [x] we may venture to *do evil that good may come, his damnation is just.* Whosoever therefore makes the Remedies so light, so easie, so obvious, doth not onely lessen but takes away the terror of the Disease, and brings it into contempt. I would therefore with all possible importunity begg of you, to set your selves against every sin; watch against the temptations, occasions, and first risings of sin. Be as shy of sins of Omission, and Male-administration, as of open wickedness; and then Indulgences will be no temptations to you to alter your Religion; then the *Jubile* (next year) which Pseudo-Catholicks esteem as [z] *the pleasant Phantasies of Popery, the Refuge of Sinners, the Grief of Purgatory, the Terror of Devils, the Mart of* Rome, *and the Triumph of the Pope*, will be no more to them than a *Bartholomew-Fair.* Do you study the Doctrine and Practice of Faith and Repentance, and you'l abhorre all fellowship with this *Doctrine of Devils.*

r Conc. Trid. Sess. 21. c. 9. p. 401.

s *Aquin.* Suppl. 3 part. q. 26. art. 4. p. 33.

t *Bellarm.* ib. Sup.

u Heb. 9. 22.

† 2 Tim. 2. 19.

x Rom. 3. 8.

z *Chamier.* Panst. Tom. 3. l. 24. c. 1. n. 5. p. 517. & c. 5. n. 11. p. 524.

Secondly, Make use of your *Bibles*, and while you do so, you'l neither be wheadled nor frighted out of your Religion. Let but Scripture-truth be your (a) *shield and buckler*, and you need not fear this *Romish* Pestilence *that walks in darkness*, and you may also hope, that God will preserve you from their barbarous destruction *that wasteth at Noon-day.* The Sword (b) of the Spirit is the onely offensive Arms in the Christian Armoury, and there's no weapon wounds them like this, and therefore (c) they wrap it in a cloth, and throw it behind the Ephod; but, my brethren, take it out, there's none like it; *hold fast the form of sound words*, which the Scripture teacheth, *in faith and love, which is in Christ Jesus*, and you can never be seduced; for there (d) can be no Heresies but by the misunderstanding of Scripture, (e) which we are not to hear onely with our Ears, but with our Minds. I take it to be a good way to prevent the perverting of Scripture, whenever a Text is alleadged for the proof of a Doctrine in question, first lay by that Doctrine, and search what is the genuine meaning of the Holy Ghost in that place, and then consider what the mind of the Holy Ghost is in that question. But I'le not be tedious, *Bellarmine* is the person I have most opposed, I'le make a fair offer, *viz.* to be determin'd by his decision of the Question, if they will stand to what he hath left upon Record, which is as applicable to this business as to that about which he wrote it, *viz.* (f) *Concerning those things which depend upon the Divine Will, we are not to assert any thing but what God himself hath revealed in the Holy Scriptures.* Do but stand to this, and *Farewell Indulgences.*

a Psal. 91. 4, 6.

b Ephes. 6. 17.

c 1 Sam. 21. 9.

d *Tertul.* de resur. carn. c. 11. p. 417.

e & adverf. Gnostic. c. 7. p. 595.

f *Bellarm.* de amiss. grat. & stat. pec. lib. 6. c. 3. p. 345.

SERMON XX.

SERMON XX.

There are But two Sacraments under the New Teſtament.

Mr Mathew Sylvester

Prov. 30. 6.

Adde thou not unto his words, leſt he reprove thee: and thou be found a lyar.

THE independency of Proverbs informs us, that we may ſpare the labour of reflections upon the Context; ſeeing every Proverb is big with its own ſence, and fully comprehends its own deſign and reach.

The words now read unto you as the Ground and Meaſure of this Morning Exerciſe, are weighty as to their *Charge* and *Arguments*.

1. The *Charge* is here imperative, born of Authority, and brought into the ſight, to bound the daring Uſurpations of aſpiring fools. The throne of God ought not to be invaded by the Sons of men; nor muſt a Peerage in his Empire be uſurped or claimed by diſtant mortals, whoſe policy and ſafety 'tis to be *Auditors* and Scholars, and not Dictators in the matters of Gods Kingdom. The beſt man is only δυνάμφος τὸ ἄλλε εἶναι, and φύσει δοῦλος, as *Ariſtotle* ſpeaks, and therefore (as he ſaid, βέλτιστοι γινόμεθα πρὸς τὸς θεὸς βαδίζοντες. *Plutarch* περὶ δεισιδαιμ. So πρὸς μὲν θεὸν βαδίζων βέλτιστος in reſpect to God, whoſe abſolute Property, and unlimited Prerogative by any thing but the bleſſed harmony of his own infinite Perfections, together with his own Omnipotence, Omniſcience, Holineſs, and Allſufficiency, being both matchleſs and incommunicable, do ſpeak him ſo fitly and undoubtedly our Owner, Governour and Father, as that obſervance and obſequiouſneſs muſt unavoidably more become us than bold pretences to his Throne and Scepter. Gods words are like himſelf, ſuch glorious Emanations of his own Majeſty and Excellence, as will neither ſuit nor bear the mean additions of aſpiring Man.

All men are Subjects, and must act by their derived Authority and Commission. Gods words are like the Sun moving in a distinct and proper Sphere, and scorning the accessions of our more dim and languid Lamps. All that put in their claims for Legislation in Church or State, are under Law for what they impose and speak, and are to be presented to the Barre of God, in answer to this universal summon, *viz.* Give an account of thy Stewardship, for thou wast but a Steward, and must be no longer so. *Adde thou not* therefore *to his words, lest he reprove thee.*

Quere 1. *What are those additions that are not forbidden to us here? Is every thing a sinfull Addition that is not found expressely in the Words of God?*

1. Words that explain the sence, and force, and usefulness of God's words, are not forbidden here, *Neh.* 8. 8. Letters, syllables and words, are not the mind of God, farther than their signification reaches. Words are the vehicles of sence; the Indices of the heart. Till they are known and opened, we are but Barbarians unto others, 1 *Cor.* 14. 11. There is no Commandment transgress'd by a true Explication of those words, whereby God signifies his mind. And to acquaint men with the proofs and characters, whereby it may be manifest, that this is God's mind, is none of those additions which God forbids to make unto his words.

2. Expres determinations of times and places in particular, for the discharge of such incumbent duties, as must be done in general, and cannot be discharged in particular, without the fixing of time and place. How can Assemblies meet together, or publick Worship be discharged, till a particular time and place be both stated and known?

3. Pertinent and distinct *Applications* of general Rules unto particular Cases, and consequently such expres Reasons and Arguments, as shall prove them pertinent and improveable, as to the case in hand. Fastings and Feastings, Prayers and Praises, Almes, Forbearance, Silence and Speaking, are in the general attended with Lawes impos'd upon all; but *quoad hic & nunc*, the calls and circumstances of emergent Providences must state and fix the Case, and shew the Duty in its Season.

4. The Modes of *Worship* may vary in their frame and use, and may be under circumstances order'd so to doe; and yet the Precept of my Text observed. I may be bound to preach, or praise, or pray; but yet the subject, length or method, and the peculiar words and phrases may be variously determined by present choyce and order.

5. The use of *natural or accessory Helps*, no wayes destructive, but subservient to our stated work, may be determined to be used, and yet this Law remain inviolated. I may use or forbear my Notes, use all those helps that are at hand, and find out words acceptable.

6. Whatever may commodiously *preserve, promote* and *quicken* due Purity, Truth and Order, and is no wayes inconsistent with Gods Laws,

and

and the true interest, ends, credit and harmony of Christian Godliness, in all its Exercises, comes not within the censure of my Text.

What is it that we must not adde unto these words of God? I answer, these things. Quere 2.

1. Nothing as God's which is not His: As Articles of Faith, new points of Doctrine, Promises, Threatnings, Prophecies, Revelations, Traditions or Miracles, pretended to be of God, that are not so, either as to God's Errand or Operation.

2. Nothing to vye with God's revealed Truths or Lawes, as to Authority or importance. For this is to usurp the Throne of God, and claim a Peerage with absolute Supremacy.

3. Nothing that savours of such additional Supplements, as seem to argue God of Ignorance, Imprudence or Negligence. For this is to turn Accusers or Upbraiders of the Holy One, as guilty of defects, miscarriages and mistakes.

4. Nothing that does destroy the End, or contradicts the Errand, or tends to weaken the awfull and successefull Influences of the Words of God. For this referres to nothing but disappointment and disturbance of the noble Ends and proper Course of Lawes and Government.

5. Nothing that builds what God destroyes, or ruines what God designs expressely and resolves to build. The wise and righteous Governour of the World is most impatient of such contradictions. When God takes down a Ceremonial frame of Worship, to clear his way to better dispensations; then to cloud his Heavens with Pompous Institutions, is to disturb and vex the Eyes of spiritual Worshippers, even with the dust and rubbish of what was taken down and thrown aside. Thus also the Commands of God must not be render'd void, through Mens Traditions, *Mat.* 15. 2---9.

6. Nothing that makes a wrong Construction of God's words. False Glosses, and corrupt Interpretations of the Truths of God, are vain and bold Additions. Can we imagine that those words can signifie God's mind, which have no sence in them nor stated import, before the Pope and Councels have set their stamp and seal upon them? Are they bound to construe right, or are they at perfect liberty to make the same Expression true and false at pleasure?

7. In one word: Nothing that superseds, or is co-ordinate with, or derogatory to God's words, in Doctrine, Government and Worship; or prejudicial, burthensome, or unprofitable unto the purity, peace, and order, Edification or needfull Harmony and consolation of Souls and Churches, strong or weak.

What are those Reasons that are produced in my Text as Dissuasive from these Additions? Quere 3.

1. The Case must be debated; the word us'd in the Text comes

from יכח that signifies to dispute the Case, and debate the matter by Argument. God pondereth all the wayes of man. All claims shall be enquired into. Bold Usurpations and Aspirings must be reflected on with a *Quo jure hoc feciſtis*. God will never prodigally diffuse his own Prerogative. Others must act by deputation and deriv'd Authority; and both their Commissions and Discharge must be produced and canvased in open Court. He that will bring every thing into open Court, will not forbear enquiries after those that so audaciously usurp his Crown and Scepter, and storm his Throne. Therefore we must carry as within the Prospect of that great Tribunal, where our precarious Allegations must abide the test.

2. The Guilty will then be exposed in open Court. God will be Conquerour in Judgement, and it will appear a Crime unanswerable, to have the Broad Seal counterfeited. Wo to all the bold pretenders to the infallible Chair, whose Claims are larger than their Right and Warrant. If *Aaron* and *Miriam* found it so costly to challenge *Moses* or a Peerage with him, what will become of those who will not suffer God to abide Greatest and undisturbed in the Throne; when Majesty appears to vindicate Supream Authority from all those bold invasions which the usurping Tyrant of Gods Church hath made? It's vigorous lustre will make his bold pretences like a thin Exhalation, to melt away and vanish. Supremacy is a tender thing, and to build Stubble, Wood and Hay upon the best Foundation, will be found no mans Gain. What's the Chaffe to the Wheat? The Word of God is tryed, and may be trusted to; but he that leans upon the Reeds of *Egypt*, will make his confident Recumbencies at least assuredly preparatory unto his most shamefull Fall. He that's found a Lyar at the Barre of God, cannot escape the smartest censures and most severe reflections that ever yet astonished and amazed Delinquents. God will not patronize the lyes and forgeries of any swelling or aspiring bubbles. Creatures must know their distance and the Truth. 'Tis here our Reputation is the most tendered thing; and he that is found a Lyar here, as speaking from God, that which is not of him, and that as for God, which really is against him, must then expect a very round discharge from God. Hence then let us take occasion to enquire,

Quere 4. *Whether Baptisme and the Lords Supper be the only Sacraments of the Covenant of Grace under the New Testament?*

1. We shall pass over now the Consideration of those words in Greek and Hebrew which *Bellarmine* layes so great a weight upon, as מלואים, חקים and רוא, and אות, *a sign*, *Gen.* 17. 11. rendered by σημεῖον, σφραγὶς, *Rom.* 4. 11. ἀντίτυπον, 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. ὑπόδειγμα, *Heb.* 8. 5. 9. 23. μυστήριον, *Latinè myſterium quod aliud exiſtit, aliud ſignificat*, from whence it is also called σύμβολον. All which words being of larger or more restrained signification, may be applyed to more or fewer things at pleasure.

2. Nor

2. Nor need we dwell upon the Covenant of Grace, ſeeing it is agreed on all hands to be a Contract betwixt God and Man, through the Mediation of Jeſus Chriſt, for the Return and Reconcilement of ſinners to God; and ſo their Juſtification, Adoption, Sanctification and Glorification. And by our ſpeaking of the Sacraments of this Covenant, we preſcind the thoughts of Sacraments in Innocence. And as in our Goſpel-times, this Covenant is publiſhed in its laſt and beſt Edition and Impreſſion, and hath been ſealed and ratified with the blood of ſprinkling, and as the Teſtament of our dying Friend, exhibited to the World by the Lord himſelf, and thoſe commiſſionated by him, *Hebr.* 2. 3, 4. And held forth plainly, powerfully and ſucceſſefully, without the vail and burthens of its former Diſpenſations under the Legal Oeconomy: So are we to conſider here what Saraments and Seals are annexed to and fixt upon it, waving all former Sacraments as to their Frame or Number.

3. Therefore the Term *Sacraments* well opened and applyed, muſt clear and end the Controverſie in this Article. And here we muſt premiſe, that the term is unſcriptural, not written in it, but derived elſewhere. And ſo we muſt enquire after ſuch things as theſe. 1. How many things in Authors are ſignified by the Term. 2. How far it may be applicable to more than theſe aſſigned in the Queſtion, and ſo how far the Controverſie lies more in words than things. 3. Wherein it is only applicable to theſe two. 4. What are the Arguments and Reaſons of the Papiſts, whereby they prove the number of them to be ſeven; and ſo give them their Anſwer. 5. Why the Proteſtants aſſert but two. Which when they are well diſpatched, may better ſhew the truth and meaſures of the Caſe in hand before us.

Firſt; As to the various *uſe* and acceptation of the word; I find the word *Sacrament* uſed in theſe ſeveral ſences.

1. It's taken for that Pledge, Pawn or *pignus* which they that fought did leave in the hands of their cheif Prieſt during their fight, when the fight was ended, the Conquerour took his own, and the other, *in pœnam injuſtæ litigationis*, loſt his, and it was devoted to the Treaſury. *Varro. Lib.* 4. *de Ling. Lat.* And this Pledge was called a Sacrament.

2. It's taken for that Oath *quo quis ſacris interpoſitis obligatur.* And this Oath or Obligation was *Sacramentum*, in that it was *obligatio Numinis & Religionis interventu confirmata*; and hence, *Sacramentum militare*, for ſuch as were liſted by Oath, and bound to continue till the War was done. So *Veget. lib.* 2. *de re militari.* Thus alſo *Jerom* calls the Oath of *Hippocrates* upon his Diſciples *Sacramentum*, *Tom.* 1. *Epiſt. ad Nepot. de vit. Cleric. & Sacerdot.* and *Juvenal* in his *Sat.* 15. calls the very *milites*, *Sacramento rogatos*, Sacraments themſelves.

Præmia nunc alia atq; emolumenta notemus.
Sacramentorum.——

3. Hence

3. Hence probably it is, that our *Votum Baptismale* was called *Sacramentum*: (a) As *Recordare tyrocinii tui diem, quo Christo in Baptismate consepultus in Sacramenti verba jurâsti.*

a *Jerom. Tom. 1. Epist. 1. ad Heliodor. de laude vit. solitar.*

4. Sometimes it is taken for no more than a meer *arcanum* or Secret. Thus the Sacrament of Incarnation, and often in this sence have you *Sacramentum* in the *Vulg. Latin. Dan.* 2. 18, 30. 4. 6. *Eph.* 1. 9. 3. 5. *Col.* 1. 27. 1 *Tim.* 3. 16. Thus any thing of occult and sacred signification, as Parables, Types, in things or Persons, *&c.* they may be called Sacraments, as *Jerom ubi suprà.* And then our Number may exceed a Septenary.

5. Sometimes it is taken for the Sign, the thing signified, and the Action, inward and outward, and the word it self, whereby God commands the *Signum propter rem signatam.*

6. Sometimes it is taken for any *sacræ rei signum.* And thus there may be as many Sacraments, as there can be Signs of holy matters by words or things.

7. Most to our purpose it imports our Dedication of our selves to God, by Vow, expres'd by solemn Ceremony, signifying a mutual Covenant betwixt God and us, and his reception of us.

Secondly, As to it's Application to the Case in hand. Let us enquire, How far it may be accommodated to more than two; and then, How far only to these two, *Baptisme*, and *the Lords Supper.* Which take as followes.

1. If it be true what *Bellarmine* asserts, that it suffices as to the Nature of a Sacrament, that it is a sensible Sign, let the sense be what it will; then I confess, there are more Sacraments than two; for every Word and Thing may be a Sacrament, that may be seen, or felt, or heard, or tasted. Then can neither of these two be a single Sacrament, but each hath many Sacraments in one. Then Penance, Matrimony, Orders, Confirmation, *&c.* are truely Sacraments. Then Books and Sermons will be Sacraments. Yea, our very Words and Actions in all our joynt Approaches unto God, will mutually be Sacraments from each to other: But did not all the Sacraments of the Old Testament consist of visible Signs? Is there no difference betwixt the Preached Word and Sacraments as such? Did Christ administer the Sacrament to all he preach'd or spake unto? How is it that St. *Austin* makes the Word and Elements to constitute a Sacrament? And do not Sacraments require a Consecration? If not, what makes the Elements a Sacrament? If they doe, then what must consecrate the words of Consecration? and so *in infinitum.* And lastly, Did the Councel of *Florence* determine aright or not, when in their Definition of a Sacrament they did distinguish the Matter and Form each from other? If they did, Then a sensible Sign barely as such is not a Sacrament: For if it were, then could it not derive its Sacramental Use and Nature from Christs Institution: For, its own aptitude, if men had pleased to use it, and determine it, had been sufficiently productive

ductive of its Sacramental Use and Nature: If they did not, what confidence can we put in Councils that have mistaken in such weighty Cases? The truth is, at this rate of speech they have secured their seven, and made sufficient room for twenty thousand more.

2. If Sacrament only import a Secret, then *Babylon* it self becomes a Sacrament. Then Types and Parables, and all the Intrigues of Church and State are Sacraments, and so whatever needs Interpretation.

3. If by a Sacrament they mean the shadowing forth by signs of any thing of a sacred Nature, then there are more than seven. Then all the Furniture of the Tabernacle and Temple, and all the instituted Rites of *Moses* must have been Sacraments, and *pari ratione* all Gospel-Ordinances, Institutions and Transactions.

4. If by a Sacrament they mean all dedicating Signs, then there may be more than two. All Signs of Dedications unto Office and Relations, as well as all intire Christianity, may be called so. Thus if I lift my Hands or Eyes to God, or solemnly subscribe an Instrument whereby I give my self to God in any service, I make a Sacrament and receive it.

5. If by a Sacrament they mean, the Signification of a Vow or Promise in any kind to God: Thus Orders, Confirmation, *&c.* may be called Sacraments, and the signification of every thing I undertake for God, as Master, Servant, Subjects or Soveraign, may be called so; nor shall we say there are no more than two.

6. If by a Sacrament they mean something of Divine Institution, as expressive of some sacred Undertaking and Relation, I shall yet grant, there are more Sacraments than two. Thus Matrimony, Orders, Confirmation, Penance, and extreme Unction too, as stated and intended under those circumstances in *Jam.* 5. are Sacraments.

7. If by a Sacrament they mean something in some respects of the same nature, use and ends, with Baptisme and the Supper of the Lord, I shall grant there are more Sacraments than two. All Offices and Relations bind to respective Faithfulness. Confirmation is the fresh owning of the same Obligations which Baptisme laid upon us. I am called to regular Penance by both these Sacraments. I may remember Christ by reading, speaking, *&c.* I may signifie my owning of my Covenant, and may renew it by Fasting, Praying, and Professing many wayes.

8. If by a Sacrament be meant some significations of the Grace of God to me, both Relative and Real, so there may be more Sacraments than two. Thus every Ordinance, Providence, and thing, expressive of Gods Grace to me, may bear the Name of Sacrament. All helps, encouragements and advantages for Heaven and Holiness, do clearly signifie Gods Care and Kindness to me. Thus the Apostles Ministry may be a Sacrament, as a clear indication of Gods kindness to him.

9. There are some Sacraments of Order that may be truely such, as Holy Orders, Matrimony; and of Office, Civil, Oeconomical and Ecclesiastical, whose root may be the Covenant of Grace. But Sacraments of Christianity import something more. Thirdly,

Thirdly, As to its more restrained and intended use, a Sacrament is a stated Ceremony ordained by Christ, made up of visible Signs; whereby our hearty dedication, and full consent to all the terms and tenders of the Covenant of Grace, and Gods acceptance of us thereunto, is signified, solemnized and ratified by God and us, according to the Propositions and Injunctions of the New Testament. Which when it is proved, will make it manifest, that either their asserting of Seven is a most shamefull and abusive noise, both of provoking and dividing Words, or else of deep and dangerous mistake in Things, and too weak to bear their *Tridentine Anathema*. Now if we view the whole description in its parts, we must consider these things, to state and clear the Case in hand. 1. Whether the whole was not intended in the first use and accommodation of the word *Sacrament*, to the concerns of Christianity? 2. Whether all this be not included in *Baptisme* and the *Eucharist*? 3. Whether it can be possibly included in any of the five Sacraments beside?

1. Therefore, as to the first Use and Application of it, to the Case in hand, 'tis clear it was thus used by *Tertullian*, and by him applyed to Baptism: For speaking *ad Martyres*, about their solemn Abrenunciation which was made in Baptism, and about other Interrogations proposed at the same time; *Vocatis* (saith he) *ad militiam in Sacramenti verba respondimus*, &c. *And thence* (saith he) *did the whole action receive its Name*. And so *adversus Praxeam*, *Fides in Patrem, Filium & Spiritum sanctum secundùm Christianorum Sacramentum, &c.* Which must at least oblige us to, and influence all suitableness of spirit and practice to the sacred Trinity, according to their several χάριτες and Relations to us, according to *Rom.* 6. 3.——6. And on the same account the *Greeks* called our two Sacraments *Mysteria*, and the Church generally understood the word in this sence, in opposition to the Heathens initiation of their Disciples into their Idolatrous Religions; and thus the Ancients write of only two Sacraments, as *Tertullian*, *Justin*, *Irenæus*, *&c.* Though *Tertullian* mention indeed Unction, and Imposition of hands, *de Resur. Carn.* yet doth he not relate them as distinct, but as appendent Ceremonies to Baptism. Thus also *Cyril* of *Jerusalem* intends the same of Chrisme. The time would fail, to speak of *Dionysius*, *Ambrose*, &c. And it is manifest, that the Doctrines of the seven Sacraments were not started, till broached by *Hugo* and *Peter Lombard*, from whom the Papists at first suck'd it, and terribly have they improved it, to bring about their most mischievous Ends.

2. As to the second, that this description doth suit the *Eucharist* and *Baptism*, is no dispute. Whence *Bellarmine* himself reflecting upon *Chemnitius*, who asserted eight things as constitutive of a Sacrament, in that sence that Baptism and the Eucharist are such: As, 1. A visible material Element or Sign. 2. A Divine Institution of it. 3. And that Command in the New Testament, and instituted there. 4. And this to the End of the World. 5. Attended with a Promise of Grace. 6. And

this

this annexed to the Sacramental Sign, and cloathed therewith even by divine Ordination. 7. And this Promiſe comprehending all the benefits of our Redemption in cloſe and full Relation to eternal Life. 8. And all this ſigned, ſealed, offered and applyed *virtute Dei*, to all that entertain theſe Sacraments by Faith. Hence *Bellarmine* inſtead of denying the truth and full Propriety of this Application, attempts to prove them applicable unto Penance, and thence would argue it to be a Sacrament.

3. As to the third, whether the other five can be as truely and fully called Sacraments with equal correſpondence to theſe eight particulars, this muſt be tryed by an equal ballance, and true examination of all particularly: And therefore the five Sacraments which muſt be brought unto the teſt, are theſe. 1. *Confirmation.* 2. *Extreme Unction.* 3. *Matrimony.* 4. *Orders.* 5. *Penance*, which is transferred unto the laſt, to introduce the reſidue of my Work.

1. As to *Confirmation.* What Elements are made the viſible and proper ſigns? By what Inſtitution is it ordained? and by what Promiſe of Grace, with reſpect to Pardon and Eternal Glory, is it encouraged and annexed? Or wherein will they fix its common and adequate relation and proportion to the two great Sacraments? What is their Confirmation (by Chriſme on Infants) for the receiving of the Holy Ghoſt, but an audacious Apiſh imitation of miraculous Operations by the Apoſtles hands? Nor can their equivocal juggles about the Promiſe of the Spirit relieve them in the Caſe, if the gift thereof as ſanctifying and comforting, of equal neceſſity and extent to all times and Chriſtians, be diſtinguiſhed from its miraculous and extraordinary Operations and Diſpenſings, which was to be appropriated to that ſealing Age, both as to Chriſtians, and extraordinary Officers and Circumſtances.

2. As to *Extreme Unction*, grounded upon *Mar.* 8. *Jam.* 5. when they can prove that theſe things are to be referred to ordinary and perpetual Ceremonies in the Church throughout all Ages, and not to the extraordinary circumſtances and Ceremonies of a Sealing day, wherein 'tis neceſſary that the Goſpel be ſealed and proved by Miracles at its firſt introduction into the world, they are more like to win the day, and prove their Unction Sacramental. But do not their own *Waldenſis*, *Alphonſus è Caſtro*, and famous *Eſtius* himſelf conclude, that *James* and *Mark* ſpeak of Miraculous Cures? Were not the parties to be anoynted, ſtricken and held with great Diſeaſes, partly contracted and deſerved by grievous Provocations, and partly inflicted to illuſtrate that miraculous Power which was then on foot. What though there be ſomewhat of analogy betwixt bodily diſeaſes, and ſin it ſelf, yet certainly Oyl had been more proper to the *vitium* than the *reatus* of their ſins: An analogy is requiſite in a Sacrament, and the Promiſe *Jam.* 5. is of Remiſſion, and Oyl that may have ſome Analogy to wounds, bears little or none to ſpots, or guilt of puniſhment.

3. As to *Matrimony*, who made it a Sacrament under the New Teſta-

ment? Or what is there in the Ordinance to make it anſwerable to the thing? and if it be a Sacrament, yet 'tis but œconomical, and it is no more divine than as it is an inſtituted Relative ſtate by God; and ſo is the Covenant betwixt Maſters and Servants: And thus the Inauguration of a King may be a Civil Sacrament. But a Sacrament of the Covenant of Grace is made compatible to all Believers: But this is not ſo, but the Prieſt muſt be barred from this Sacrament, leſt it impair his Purity. But they alleadge, it is called a Myſtery, *Eph.* 5. 31. and have not the Woman and the Beaſt the ſame Name? *Rev.* 17. 1. yea, doth not *Cajetan* affirm this place no argument that Matrimony is a Sacrament? Aware 'tis like he was of that which followes cloſely in the Text, *viz. I ſpeak of Chriſt, &c.* What trifling ſubtleties do they (the Papiſts) uſe to amuſe the World, as if they did deſign to be more ſtudious to walk in darkneſs, than to prevent or heal the wounds and breaches of the Church.

4. As to *Orders.* Though this may be a Sacrament of Order, and *truely ſo*, yet is not that commenſurate with a Sacrament of Chriſtianity. All are not Miniſters that may be poſſeſs'd of preſent Grace, and have a title to Remiſſion of ſins and everlaſting Glory. And it ſeems ſomething odde, that one Sacrament of the ſame Covenant, ſhould make men uncapable of another. As alſo that two different Sacraments inconſiſtent on the one hand, ſhould have the ſame ſign. And it is yet more ſtrange, that this ſhould be equal to Baptiſm and the Euchariſt, and yet ſhould want a viſible Element for its ſign.

5. And as for *Penance*, (as far as God requires it, and ſtates its uſe and nature) doth not Baptiſm relate and bind us to it? Is it not Baptiſm of Repentance for the Remiſſion of ſins? What is the external Right? And where is the acceſſion of the Word unto the Sign whereby it muſt be made a Sacrament? What is there in this Penance commenſurate with Baptiſm.

Fourthly, As to their many Reaſons amongſt the Schoolmen for their Septenary number, let them name any thing ſubſtantial, that is not reducible to theſe two Sacraments. Their ſeptenary number of different Conditions, or Vertues, or Diſtempers; theſe two Sacraments will comprehend them all: for they contain what is fully ſuitable to every ſtate, urges to every vertue, and tends to cure our ſpiritual diſtempers; and what need we Seven of theirs, when Chriſt hath inſtituted Two to do the work? But let us conſider what they ſay. We will inſiſt upon the Reaſons therefore, whereon they would eſtabliſh the Septenary number of their Sacraments, and anſwer them.

1. They tell us, that the Number *ſeven* is famous, and of frequent uſe and ſtrict importance in the Scriptures; as *Aarons* Garments put on by his Sons ſeven dayes, the Attonement for the Altar ſeven dayes, Blood ſprinkled ſeven times, *Naaman* waſhing ſeven times: Thus 'tis a number famous in Expiations, and otherwiſe; hence now *Eliphaz* muſt take

ſeven

seven Bullocks, and seven Rams, and go to *Job*, *ch.* 42. *v.* 8. Seven Gifts of the Spirit, and thus seven of the Apocalyptical Seals, Trumpets, Starres, *&c.* To which I answer. 'Tis wonderfull, they took no * notice of this too, that the number of seven commenced from the compleat finishing of Nature as to its Order and Existence, and Gods resting from his Labours; all which was done within a Septenary of dayes, making the first week as it was in the beginning.

* Since the writing of this Head I have found some Papists insist on this very thing.

2. Were this digested into an Argument, thus it would run: Whatever Number is of famous use and mention in the Scripture, must be the Number of Sacraments, under the New Testament, of the Covenant of Grace. But seven is such a Number, *&c.* *Ergo*—— 'Tis the Number of Sacraments, and consequently, there are seven. And what if the major Proposition be denyed, will they not be sorely exercised to prove it? what if we charge the Number in the Minor, and say, that One is the Number of famous use and frequent mention, will it not then be found, that whatsoever answers this *Medium* for One, will do their work for seven? I mean to answer it. How many Ones are used and mentioned *Eph.* 4. 4, 6? One God, Christ, Faith, Baptism, Church, Spirit, Hope, Heaven, *&c.* What do they think of two Lights or Luminaries, two Tables of the Law, two Cherubims, two Covenants, two Commandements? What do they think of Twelve Patriarchs, twelve Tribes, twelve Apostles, twelve thousand sealed, twelve Gates, *&c?* Are these therefore Twelve Sacraments? and so of other Numbers. Now if this Argument be followed close, they must be brought to this, That either this is no Argument for their Number of Sacraments, or that their Number must rise and fall according to what Number we shall pitch upon, and so there may be one, or two, or seven, or twelve Sacraments, &c. and so in what sence, and why so many and no more. And further, thus the Reason would press as hard for seven Sacraments under the Law as Gospel: and as to Expiations and Consecration, do not two Rams, two Goats, two Turtle-doves, or two young Pidgeons, bid as fair for only two Sacraments, as seven of other things can bid for seven Sacraments? And thus much for this Argument fetcht from the congruence or apt agreement of Numbers.

2ly, Let us take notice of those Arguments which *Aquinas* brings for the proof of seven Sacraments. *Part.* 3. *Quest.* 65. *Art.* 1.

1. The Analogy or Proportion betwixt Natural and Spiritual Life. And here 'tis worth enquiry, whether all they say be not intended in these two. 1. For the *Esse per generationem:* This is designedly in our Baptism, which is the Laver of Regeneration, considered relatively, as we are baptized into new Relations, to which our cordial acceptance in capable subjects (I mean the adult) is absolutely necessary before God; and a Profession thereof (probably serious) before the Church. And whether this be Grace or no, let it be considered for the doubting under its proper head. And as for those that talk of inward, real, subjective

Grace, by the Application of the outward Elements, and that this Grace is in the Elements, they must assert this to be wrought at the rate of a Miracle; which, when 'tis proved to be wrought by proper, necessary, instituted Resultancy from the Sacraments, shall be assented to. And I believe they will find it hard to prove subjective Grace wrought by the Sacraments themselves, otherwise than by moral objective Influence. And whatever else is wrought, is done by some distinct Operations of the Spirit, even as 'tis done when the Word of God is made to work effectually. And as for the rest, the same answer will serve them all. As Increase in Confirmation, Nourishment in the Eucharist, medicinal reparations of the lapsed by Penance, removal of the reliques of Diseases by Exercise and Diet, to which they make Extreme Unction to be analogous; Orders in relation to publick Exercise, to compleat vital Perfection; and Matrimony for the propagation of an holy seed. For these I would fain know, whether the two Sacraments which we plead for and they own, do not referre to all these things, in that they bind us to, and in their kind help us in all that is pretended as designed by the other five? And as for Confirmation, doth it bind us to, or seal to us any thing new, distinct materially from Baptism? Or is it not rather (orderly dispensed) the renewal of the Baptismal Covenant.

2. As for what is alleadged by way of remedy, against distempers, or in relation to those distinct Graces and Vertues wherein we are concerned. Both are considered, and abundant Provisions against the one, and for the other, are made in these two Sacraments, so far as they are proper to Christianity as such. And so speak all Christians as such, to be concerned in them. And if any thing falls out to some that is not incident to all, 'tis fit that it be referred to its proper head, in Order, or Prudence, or the like. And if they will contend about the name of Sacrament, let them have it, provided that in things they will distinguish (and let us understand they do so) betwixt what is a Sacrament of Order, and what is a Sacrament of entire Christianity. And that they will explain their own *Tridentine* words, *Caranz. Epit. Conc. in Conc. Trid. Sess. 7. cap. 3. de Sacram. in gener.* See *Reinolds* against *Hart*, in his *Confer. chap. 8. div. 4. p.* (*mihi*) 602.

And having now dispatch'd the point of the seven Sacraments (about which I could have spoken more, but that I care not for those Controversies that are made so intricate by a resolved espousing of words and phrases, whose sence is arbitrary and undetermined) amongst which, Penance was transferred unto the last, it will not be amiss to make some short reflections upon the Popish Doctrines of Humane Satisfactions, which they make a branch of Penance, and with Contrition and Confession to be constitutive of it.

Con. il. Trident. Sess. 14. Cap. 8, 9. Rom. Catech. de Satisfact.

The Councel of *Trent* asserts it false and alien from the Word of God, to say, That the fault is never remitted by God, but the whole Punishment is pardoned too. And so the *Trent* Doctors striking harmony with the

the *Roman* Catechism assert, That when God forgives a Sinner, he yet forgives not all the Punishment, but leaves the party by his own works to satisfie till it be wash'd away; and these works are all good Actions inward or outward, proceeding from Vertue, as Confessions, Almes, Fastings, Prayers, Sufferings in this Life, or in Purgatory: and the things that we satisfie God for by our good works, are 1. Temporal Punishments. 2. The Reliques of sin. 3. The fault it self. 4. The same Punishment wherewith the Damned are afflicted, Eternity only being abstracted from them. And here we must consider, 1. How they *distinguish*, 2. What they *conclude*, and so how far they come to us, and wherein we part.

I cannot now speak to this head or part of humane Satisfactions largely, but I shall content my self at present with some brief touches and reflections thereupon. For this matter is *divisim* & *membratim* more closely and fully handled by others in this Exercise.

First, For the Distinctions; they are upon three Heads principally.

(1.) They distinguish upon Sin: and they tell us, that it is considered here, as 1. Either before Baptism; or 2. After Baptism. 1. That before Baptism is either Original or Actual: and 2. That after Baptism is considerable either in (1) Relation to its Object most immediately concerned, which is either 1. God, or 2. Man; (though in the general notion every sin against Man is against God too, whose Lawes are broken by our Irregularities as to our selves, or one another;) and then as in relation to its (2) Quality or Aggravation, 'tis either *venial* or *mortal*: And here you must consider, 1. The Fault, 2. The Stain, and then 3. The Punishment; which we transferre to be considered as the next Head of Distinctions: where we shall consider it; and to the other part, 'tis thus replyed.

1. Sin is considerable in the general Notion as a transgression of the Law of God. Now the Law is transgress'd in reference to either our Hearts or Actions. Sin in the Heart is considerable as to (1) Its Derivation into the Heart or Nature of Man, by Original transmission to all the children of apostate *Adam*: Or, (2) its Interest and in-dwellings in the Heart, and corrupting prevalent influences upon it. And so here we must distinguish betwixt, 1. What God doth as an offended righteous Ruler in a course of Punishment, making severe and just reflections upon our Nature because of the violation of the Law of our Creation: And, 2. What is done by Man as under the circumstance of his Primitive Forfeiture and Disease, which our Parents first miscarriage brought into the world. And then we say, (1) God justly might and did withdraw that Spirit of Holiness from *Adam* which he by sinning thrust away, and left him in that ataxy and disorder which man so willingly threw himself into, so as that he had no Holiness and Rectitude to transmitt to his Posterity. And, (2) Apostate, and thereupon corrupted *Adam* could not communicate a better Nature to Posterity than he had himself. Nor, (3) Was God bound in Governing Justice to set his Seed under such comfortable Circumstances as he did set himself: And (4) the rather because the Miseries of all his Seed was part of the Punishment which was due to him; even as their Holiness and Felicity ought to have been a powerfull

motive

motive, and ſhould have been a ſure reward to his Obedience, and continuance in his due Integrity. Now 2ly, As to its in-dwellings and intereſt in the heart, and dreadfull Influences upon it, they ſtill abide in ſome meaſure, and are owned and acknowledged in our Baptiſmal Covenant, wherein we do accept of the Spirit as our Sanctifier, which he could not be unleſs we were defiled, and acknowledged our ſelves to be ſo. Nor can we any more conclude the perfection of the Sanctification of our Natures, by our being baptized into the Holy Ghoſt, than we can conclude our perfect Glorification and Salvation by being baptized into the Father and the Son; all being to be wrought and perfected in a way of gradual motions, proficiently, anſwerably to thoſe healing Rules and Remedies that are before and with us, to be obſerved and improved by us. And as to ſinfull actions, they are the products of our ſinfull hearts; and we promiſe to prevent them (as much as in us lies) for time to come, even as we do profeſs and exerciſe Repentance for what is paſt and gone. And here our Covenant-cloſures, and anſwerable Converſations afterwards, are no further ſatisfactory unto God, than as they anſwer his commanding will, as our Obedience to him, and as the performed Conditions of our Salvation which God hath made ſuch.

2. Sin in relation to its Object, is either againſt God or Man; conſiſting either in doing what we ought not, or not doing what we ought, and as we ought to doe, with reference to all thoſe circumſtances and relations in which and under which we ſtand as to God and Man, either our ſelves or others; and on both theſe we ſhould or do reflect with an anſwerable frame of ſpirit thereunto, as far as our miſcarriages have been and are known to have been committed againſt God or Man, or both. And here [by God,] I mean the ſacred Trinity, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt: and thus our ſins before and after Baptiſm are the ſame as to their formal Nature, (*viz.* they are tranſgreſſions of the Law of God whenever they are committed) although by ſome acceſſary circumſtances they may differ in degree: And thus 'tis true, that to break the Laws of God after the ſolemn Vow of Baptiſm to the contrary, is worſe than to do it before, and may require ſome ſmarter Diſcipline and Repentance, in that the Obligation of a Vow that is made (and ſuch a ſolemn Vow is Baptiſm) doth greatly aggravate the ſin; and hence, 'tis likely, did ariſe that primitive Penance impoſed upon Profeſſors lapſed after Baptiſm into Heatheniſm, or other ſcandalous miſcarriages, in order to their own Recovery and Eſtabliſhment, the ſatisfaction of the Church about the uſefull truth of their Repentance, with reference to their reſtauration; the vindication of the Purity of Chriſtianity, againſt the Calumnies of others; and the prevention of the Revolts of others; and ſo the quickning of all to regular Care and Watchfulneſs about their perſeverance and proficiency in Chriſtian Growth and Godlineſs; that ſo thereby it might be manifeſt in the eyes of all about them, how much the Rules and Diſcipline of Chriſtianity did ſecure, promote and quicken

quicken all Righteousnes, Sobriety and Godlines, at the highest rate in the world.

3. Sin in relation to the strength and measures of its Malignity, and as it referres to the Quality of our state, is either consistent or inconsistent with the state of saving Grace. And here it is not so much to be considered what is lawfull or unlawfull, as what is possible or impossible to be in a truely Regenerate Heart. 'Tis possible, a good Heart may not do every thing that is required of him, and yet it is unlawfull to let the least thing be by him neglected. I have yet met with none that dare declare and stand to it, That there hath never been the least remisnes or neglect that by their utmost possible care could be prevented, since they were first converted unto God; but all, in every thing they do with God, and for God, dread to be dealt with according to their best performances in exact proportion to their merit. We do depend upon Christs Merits and Intercession, and use his Name to beg our pardon for Irregularities even in our holiest performances; and certainly the serious Heart will dread to complement with its God. And therefore when the Papists talk of *venial* and *mortal* sins, and tell us that Mortal sins can have no satisfaction but from Christ, but Venial sins may be satisfied for by our selves; let them but freely tell us what they mean. 1. Is any sin so venial as that it cannot merit the Wrath of God hereafter, by any Law which he hath made? Is not the transgression of Gods Law the formal Nature of sin? doth not that very Law pronounce every delinquent worthy of Death? is not Death the indication and execution of divine displeasure? Is not Death comprehensive of all Miseries, as it was stated in the sanction of the first Law? Are not sins dignified from their Object? a gentle stroke when given in Anger, though in its nature it be but little, yet if given to a Prince, receives another stamp and character; and as to God, if the matter be great, there is no dispute but the sin is great, as Blasphemy, *&c.* if it be small, the sin is great, because the great God is denyed his will; although his claims were mean and easie as to the matter of them. Did God bid us do some great thing, would we not do it? how much more when he commands what is but small for us to do, would not the neglect savour of great contempt even in a small affair? 2. Do they by *venial* sins mean such as do not prove our full revolt from God, because 'tis possible such a sin may be committed by one that yet doth hold to God as his great and only End and Rest? why then We own as well as They, that every fault and slip proves not a person to be forthwith Graceless. 3. Do they by *venial* sins intend such sins as do or may be pardoned upon Repentance, Faith, and New Obedience? if so, it will put them sorely to it to mention any sin, though never so hainous in its nature (the sin against the Holy Ghost excepted) which a right hearty, practical Repentance and Faith in the Lord Jesus, *&c.* may not obtain the pardon of; and in this sence no sins are *mortal* but those which unavoidably bring the Soul to Hell at last, and that through final Infidelity

and

and that through final Infidelity and Impenitence: and hence we shall the better understand what can be meant by these sins being to be satisfied for by us, and in what sence they may be so. For if they mean, that the Blood of Jesus was not needfull to make them pardonable upon those terms, proposals and conditions of their pardon, which God hath tendred in the Gospel; Christ is apparently contemned and undervalued: But if they mean, that the pardon will not be had unless the Conditions be performed by us, it is most true; and if they mean something else, they must declare and prove it to us.

(2.) As for the Things for which our *Satisfactions* must be made, they tell us, they are, 1. Temporal punishments; as (1) All the Miseries of this Life in relation to our Bodies, Goods or Name. (2) Death it self. (3) The pains of Purgatory, which are loss and pain, the same with Hell it self in Kind and Nature, though different in Duration, and it may be something in Degree. For as to the Eternity of pains in Hell, 'tis but an Accident thereof; and for Substance we must satisfie: For the Eternity thereof Christ is responsible, who hath made them temporal that they might be removed by our satisfactions. And then we must satisfie 2. For the Reliques of sin: 3. For the Fault it self: And 4. For the Punishment of the Damned in Hell, if the Eternity thereof be but abstracted from it. To which I answer,

1. Whoever is concerned to make Satisfaction, is considered either in relation to Property as a Debtor, &c. or in relation to Law as a Malefactour. Now as to the case in hand, as Sinners are looked upon as Debtors, so they relate to God as their Proprietary and absolute Lord of his own; and so they may be look'd upon as having taken, or detained from God something that is not theirs but his, which yet he might have parted with, and yet do himself no hurt; or else something which they have neither right unto, nor can God part withall without his prejudice or dammage. If in their former sence the thing be taken, 1. Then Satisfaction demanded from our selves, or from another, rather resulted from Gods Will than from his Wisdom. For it had been no incongruity for God to have retreated from his Right, where neither his Truth nor Wisdom is concerned to forbid it; for who can blame a Creditor for want of Goodness, (when there wants nothing else) in that he doth forgive a Debtor? 2. Then there was no need of Satisfaction in the Case. God's single Power could have recovered his own again. 3. For God to have his own again was all that he could look for. In that he had no prejudice but the meer alienation of his own again, and that not so much from his Property as his Possession: For no mans Apostasie from God could rob God of his title unto the Man, for that is too fast and absolute to be changed. And if God be only concerned as to his Possession; when his Goods are come again into his own hands, no greater Satisfaction can be made. 4. When God hath all his own again, there can be nothing left to make him Satisfaction with, seeing God hath a right to all that

that we can do as our Proprietary, and ever had, and could never juſtly be denyed it. But ſecondly, if you take the matter in the latter ſence, as ſomething is taken or detained, unto Gods real prejudice and dammage. 1. Then alſo Gods Omnipotence could have repaired his loſs. But, 2. Nothing can poſſibly impoveriſh God, whoſe abſolute and infinite Happineſs and Riches are nothing but himſelf, whoſe Property is abſolute, and his Omnipotence its full ſecurity. But now, if our ſins ſpeak a relation to a violated Law, and ſo God be conſidered as a Ruler, then we muſt mean, that we muſt compenſate that injury which in the courſe of Government we have already done to God, by the diſhonour we have done him in contradicting Gods righteous Will, breaking his Laws, and diſturbing or diſſolving his fixed courſe in Government; or we muſt do ſomething elſe that ſhall as well ſecure the Governours Honour, anſwer his Ends and Will in Government, as our deſtruction for our folly can amount to; and what that is, we poſſibly may underſtand hereafter, as the Papiſts do interpret and intend it.

2. As to the things for which theſe humane Satisfactions are required, they are it ſeems, (1) Temporal Puniſhments. But, 1. Is it not ſtrange, the Puniſhment ſhould be born in our own Perſons, and in its kind too, and yet that ſatisfaction ſhould be made at the ſame time too? Is it good ſence to ſay, that there muſt be, *Redditio ejuſdem*, the payment or reſtoring of the ſame thing exacted, which is the bearing of the Penalty, and yet at the ſame time doing or bearing *æquivalentis*, ſomething proportionable and in lieu thereof. 2. As for the Pains of Purgatory, I ſhall leave that to a better Pen, that is concerned in that head; and thither I referre the Reader. 3. As to Death it ſelf, are voluntarineſs, and Patience ſatisfactory here? if ſo, for what? Is it the ſtroke of Death? why is it not then diſpenſed with, and ſo we made immortal, to ſcape that dreadfull blow? and further, why may not ſuch a frame of patience and ſubmiſſiveneſs prevent the ſtroke? what makes them ſatisfactory? is it becauſe they are pleaſing unto God? then *Enoch* ſatisfied for his death, and therefore ſcaped it, *Heb.* 11. 5. and yet another doth as truely ſatisfie for death, that bears it, as he that bears it not. 4. As to thoſe other Puniſhments in this Life, the holieſt man may have them all, and oft-times feels them more than he that never was ſolicitous to pleaſe his Maker, or make him ſatisfaction. It is not at the choyce of any, whether the puniſhments that God inflicts ſhall be born or no; and Nature teaches men to chooſe the gentleſt ſtrokes; and if the ſufferings of this Life be not voluntary, undue, æquivalent, they make not compenſatory ſatisfaction. 5. As to thoſe Reliques of ſin, what ſatisfaction are they capable of, diſtinct from their being purged away bythe Grace of God in the due uſe of proper Means, and from our Releaſe as to their binding of us over to the wrath of God, and the due ſentence of his Law? 6. As to the Fault it ſelf, how, and in what ſence is it capable of our ſatisfaction? Can any thing make it true, that I was never guilty of the fact I did?

That a Sinner hath been a Sinner is an eternal Truth, after delinquencies and faults committed. Can any thing make it true, I ought to have done what I have done amiſs? can any thing make it true, that what was done amiſs never deſerved the wrath of God? or that it was not juſt and fit, that he who broke the Law of God ſhould dye? Can any thing make it warrantable, that I ſhould break the Law of God, or ſafe for me to do it, when God ſaith it is not? And when you have conſidered in Sin, the fact and faultineſs, and the chargeableneſs of both upon the Sinner, and the truth of all, and have preſcinded theſe in the conſideration of its being ſatisfied for by us; you will find it can in no ſence be capable of ſatisfaction, but as to our being purged from its commanding, or releaſed from its condemning power. And can I do any thing for God that can be as gratefull to God, as it would have been to him that I had never ſin'd againſt him? or can any thing be done by me that can do equal ſervice to my Rulers will and honour, and the due Ends of Government, with my perfect Innocence and Obedience? or can I do any thing for God, that in ſtrict proportion of deſert can merit any being cleanſed from the ſtain and blemiſh which a fault hath left upon me? If not, then let the Papiſts tell me in what ſence a fault can be capable of our ſatisfactions, that ſhall keep it from connoting, either 1. Puniſhment, and ſo it is no further pardoned than the Puniſhment is remitted, or 2. Purgation, and then it doth import no more than being ſanctified or reformed: From whence it follows, that their fundamental Maxim is a precarious though confident Aſſertion and Concluſion, or an ambiguous Cheat, *viz.* That they that ſay, *That the Fault is never remitted by God, but the whole Puniſhment is pardoned too*; ſpeak that which is falſe, and in no wiſe owned by the Word of God. For, 1. 'Tis evident, that nothing can make an Act that was ſinfull when committed, clear from the charge and cenſure of having been a fault; and in this ſence, ſinfull Actions are incapable of Remiſſion, and therefore forreign to the caſe in hand. 2. If they mean hereby, (I mean by a Fault remitted) the extirpation of a ſinfull Principle, and prevention of the ſame ſinfull Action or miſcarriage in kind; and ſo that this may be in many who are not excuſed from the juſt inflictions of miſeries of Life, and pains of Death. 'Tis granted, that the beſt men alive are not unjuſtly dealt with, if they be viſited with the Puniſhments of Life and Death, becauſe of the Garden-quarrel, and thoſe corrupted Natures which were derived thereby, together with our perſonal delinquencies. 3. But if they mean, by the Remiſſion of a fault, God's taking off thoſe Puniſhments, and diſcharging from the ſentence of the Law, whereto the Fault had bound me, the remiſſion of the Fault and puniſhment are of the ſame extent.

(3) They diſtinguiſh upon ſatisfaction, and ſay that ſatisfaction either doth relate to rigorous Juſtice, or to gratuitous acceptance. (1.) The former cannot be made by any thing but, 1. What is our own; 2. What is undue; 3. What is of equal dignity and value. And theſe things (ſay they)

they) cannot be attributed to any but Christ himself, who alone can *Deo paria reddere*. But then (2) the latter Satisfaction is by Gratuitous Acceptance, and so, by the favourable Condescension of the offended Ruler, men may satisfie as far as God will give them assisting and accept ng Grace; and thus what with the Spirits help by inward Grace, and the tincture of the Blood of Jesus by Gods Grace upon our works to make them satisfie, we being one with Christ our Head, and communicating of his satisfaction for us, derive that merit from him into our works, which make them satisfactory; which works being the works of the Spirit, and coming thence, derive a certain infinity and equality, whereupon ensues the Grace of Evangelical Councels, whereby we are exhorted and perswaded to what we are not commanded, and thereupon it followes, that we have something that is our own, and undue to God, and therefore satisfactory, and the more easily satisfactory because of the third Grace of Remission, which removes the Eternity from the Punishment, and makes it temporal, that so our satisfaction for it may be more possible and easie. So then, that may be done by Grace for satisfaction, which in strict Justice is impossible; and then do but consider what 1. God enjoyns you to; as vehement and intense Contrition, and this will do your work for Death and Purgatory, outward laborious works, as Fastings, Prayer, *&c.* as also Almesdeeds. 2. Consider what may be enjoyned by others, as the Priests enjoyning the visitings of Shrines of Saints, so many *Ave*'s and *Pater Noster*'s, and other Penance. And 3. What you may do your selves, by voluntary Pilgrimages, Fastings, Scourgings, Sackcloth, Weepings, Prayers in such Numbers and Measures, and all other severities by self-punishment; and set upon these with an intent to satisfie, and the punishment of your Sins will be revers'd; because these things are more than you are bound to do, or God required of you. I pretermit the points of Indulgences, Purgatory, and other mens Satisfactions, for they are the Business and Employment of better Heads and Pens, engaged in this Morning Exercise. And as for Treasuries, and the Popes power to dispense them, I think if he can do it, he is bound to pardon all on Earth, and release those in Purgatory; and lives in *mortal* sin if he love not his Neighbour as himself: And I believe, were he in Purgatory, he would thank those kindly that would release him quickly; and then the Precept binds him to do as he would be done by. But on the other part, these Reflexions may suffice which follow.

1. *Satisfaction* is defined by the School-men, by a voluntary Reddition of something equivalent, otherwise undue; (for so the word *satis* doth import, and *satisfaction* signifies something that is sufficient) and *sufficiency* imports an equal correspondence of that which is returned, to that for which it is returned, and that both *in Beneficiis & Pœnis*, in Benefits and Punishments: And hence it followes, that he who returns less for sin than Divine Justice doth exact, doth not satisfie, although he doe to the full what is enjoyned him by his Confessour. Though yet he

Alteinst. in Lexico Gabr. dist. ib. qu. 2. Artic. 1. ex Scoto in dist. 3. qu. 1. lib. 4.

doe *aliquam pœnam peccato ſuo debitam ſolvere, ſoluturus in futuro quod minùs injunctum eſt, & ſolutum in præſenti*; yet even here they are not agreed in the Caſe. For though thoſe mentioned in the Margent aſſert this Doctrine, yet others ſay, that Satisfaction is not to be made by ſomething otherwiſe undue; as *Durand. d. 15. qu. 1. Cajet. Tract. de Satisfact. q. 1.* and *Angleſ. in flores Queſt. part. prim. Queſt. de Satisfact. p. (mihi) 253.* concludes, That works otherwiſe due *ratione Præcepti*, as commanded, if they be done in Grace, are ſatisfactory for the Pains of Purgatory; and Martyrdome is his inſtance, and he tells us, that he is injurious that prayes for a Martyr to him; and this he makes to be the ſence of *Cajetan* and *Durand.* But to addreſs our ſelves unto the Caſe in hand: Satisfaction being the doing of ſomething that is ſufficient, hath a relation to either, 1. Commutative Juſtice, relating as to perſonal Debts or Injuries; and here the ground of his demanding Satisfaction that is wronged, or Creditor, is his own perſonal juſt Intereſt and title to what he claims, and the juſt Meaſures of our Satisfaction are to be fetch'd from both the juſt intrinſecal value and worth of what we are to make him ſatisfaction for, and alſo its relative worth to him whoſe loſs by the abſence of his own proper Goods, and all the dammage that accrues to him thereby, muſt have its equal compenſation from him that is Debtor or Injurious, unleſs ſome other accidents (as the Debtors inability, or Creditors diſtance, or the like,) make it impoſſible to make this ſatisfaction; and then, *nemo tenetur ad impoſſibile.* Or, 2. It relates to Diſtributive Juſtice, as the wrong which doth require our ſatisfaction may relate to Law and Government; and here the Rulers Honour and the Ends of Government, muſt give and ſtate the Meaſures of our Satisfaction; for in the whole, our Satisfaction, if truely ſuch, muſt bear proportion hereunto; and then whatever (upon the whole) doth exceed the bounds and claims of Gods Propriety, Excellence, Authority and Beneficence, and all that merit which doth and muſt reſult herefrom, cannot be called undue, and therefore amount to ſatisfaction in the ſtrict ſence. But in a comprehenſive and large ſence, God may be ſaid to be ſatisfied in ſeveral ſences. 1. As his Will is pleaſed by doing what is demanded of us under our preſent or ſuppoſed Circumſtances, and thus we ſatisfie his will as far as we doe what he commands us. 2. By Reparation of the Governing wrong and injury that is done him; and thus that ſatisfaction which muſt anſwer the wrong that is already done by our Apoſtaſie from God, is and can be only made by Chriſt. But that injury which would enſue from the Impunity of Delinquents, (here I mean ſuch Delinquents as finally reject the Remedy that God hath given them by Chriſt) muſt be compenſated by their own bearing of their deſerved and entailed Penalty; and thus God is ſatisfied againſt their wills by their effectual tranſmiſſion to their deſerved wracks and tortures. Or, 3. By perfect innocent Obedience to the whole Law; and they that challenge, let them maintain, poſſeſs and prove it, or 4. By a full anſwering of Gods vindictive

And the ſame *Angleſ.* concludes a little after, That the Prieſt can *imponere pro ſatisfactione peccatorum opera alias debita*, and for their differences through moſt of this Doctrin of Satisfact. ſee *Whites way to the Church*, pag. 133.

vindictive Juſtice, by ſuffering here what is equivalent to the full latitude and importance of their deſerved puniſhments in Hell; and where is that ſelf-auſterity and diſcipline here in exerciſe, or poſſibly to be met with, that is equivalent to God's revenging ſtrokes and wrath in Hell? Who hath an Arm like God, to ſtrike like him? Or who would if he could, afflict himſelf at the proportionable rate of Gods omnipotent revenge, whenas the proſpect of Chriſt's approaching Cup had ſuch impreſſions on his Heart and Countenance? But we paſs on to the next Head.

2. *Satisfaction* is here ſpoken of under a double Notion and Relation, and ſo divided into, (1) That which referres to ſtrict and rigorous Juſtice, or (2) To Gratuitous Acceptance. In the former Chriſt only is concerned, as only capable of making it; becauſe what Chriſt did, and was to do as ſatisfactory, was 1. His *own*, 2. *Undue*, 3. And of equal *value* and *dignity*. But in the latter, our capacity is large and good. And here we have, 1. The *matter* of our poſſible Satisfaction. Some things voluntary; Pilgrimages, Faſtings, *&c.* Some things enjoyned (1) By God, as vehement and intenſe Contrition, laborious works and Almeſ-deeds, *&c.* And (2) By the Prieſt, as the viſiting of Shrines of Saints, ſo many *Ave*'s and *Pater-Noſters*, with other Penance. And then we have, 2. The Grounds and Means whereby our voluntary and enjoyned works are ripened into ſuch Dignity and Value as ſhall make them ſatisfactory: Namely, (1) God's condeſcending and accepting Grace. (2) The tincture of the Blood of Chriſt, our Union to him, and communicating of his Satisfaction, from whence our Works derive their Merit. And, (3) The inward workings and aſſiſting Grace of the Spirit, by which our works proceed from inward vertue, and ſo derive a certain Infinity and Equality. So that now the door is widely open to Evangelical Counſels, to which you are exhorted and perſwaded, but not commanded.

1. Then let us hence conſider, How far Chriſts Satisfaction doth extend it ſelf, and ſee what room there is left for Humane Satisfactions, that ſo we may the better find and fix them, and ſo conſider them more exactly in their proper Place and Office. And (1) They here acknowledge, that the Matter of Chriſt's Satisfaction (beſides its being undue, and his own) is of equal dignity and value; but then I ask, with what is it of equal Dignity and Value? Is it not with the injury which he as Governour received by the Apoſtaſie of his Creatures? Or with that Rectoral gain, which he would otherwiſe get from their deſtruction, or both? What injury could God be capable of, but contradicting his governing Will, ecclipſing of his governing Honour, and preventing or obſtructing his noble Ends in Government, whereby it was made and rendred unbecoming God, to place his heart upon, and diſtribute his choyceſt Bleſſings to the Sons of men, in ſuch methods, and upon ſuch terms, as might make his Subjects juſtly think, he was grown regardleſs of his

Honour,

Honour, Laws and Government. Revolted man must either be destroyed or saved; if he be ruined, the glorious explications of Gods incomprehensible Love and Wisdom, by pardoning Grace and Mercy, in such consistency with his Truth and Holiness, had been prevented, together with such wise supplantings of Sathans Projects, Hopes and Triumphs, as *Now* he is effecting in his Gospel-methods; and the Revivals of Religion in an Apostate Tribe. Had man been saved immediately, without the execution of Gods violated Law upon him, and any equivalent consideration in the Case, the glorious Effects and proper Demonstrations, and so all suitable and usefull apprehensions of governing Justice, Wisdom, Holiness and Truth, so dear and proper to the Ruler, had been prevented; and both their Honour and essential Existence had been exposed unto the jealousies and suspicions of his Subjects; the Trust and Title of a Ruler had not been answered by its due administrations and discharge; Hopes of Impunity had been started, notwithstanding after miscarriages, to the great prejudice of Laws and Government, and suitable Obedience thereunto. And hereupon, nothing amounts to satisfaction that brings not things unto this Issue, That sinfull and Apostate Mans Salvation shall as much secure, promote, and speak the Harmony and Honour, of Gods whole Name as Governour, and all his Ends in Government; as mans destruction. (2) They must acknowledge, that Christ hath only and effectually satisfied his Father thus far, by what he did and suffered, as that Repentance, Faith and New Obedience, are by the Covenant of Grace made the Conditions of our full Recovery and Salvation, so as that they who fulfill the Conditions of the Gospel shall reap the Blessings of it. (3) Nor are they able or ready to deny, that all assisting and accepting Grace, and all the Means of Grace subservient thereunto, only result and issue from Christs satisfaction. Nor (4) Will they say, that any thing in Man without respect to the Redeemers Satisfaction, and the Fathers arbitrary, compassionate and condescending Grace, could have deserved of God to be accepted as a sufficient ground for readmission to his favour, or a sufficient compensation of our demerits. For, what Christ did was needless, if the great Ends thereof could have been answered and attained by us without it. They dare not say, that God was bound in Justice to accept of that *without*, which now is made acceptable *by* Christs Satisfaction. (5) Therefore the Meritoriousness and availableness of their supposed or asserted Humane Satisfactions, must (in their judgements) be derivative from Christ, and that assisting and accepting Grace that comes, must be upon the reckoning of Christs Satisfaction. (6) Whatever is commanded by God in Christ upon the penalty of otherwise forfeiting all the Benefits of Christs Satisfaction, and our Eternal Happiness thereupon, can be no further called Satisfaction, than as our stated Doing of what is commanded as our Duty, and as the Condition of our Salvation performed by us; which can no further merit our Impunity, than as God hath promised

promised and entailed that to and upon what is required of us.

2ly, Let us consider, what this *Satisfaction* by gratuitous Acceptation doth amount unto, and in what things we are to fix it. And, (1) Whatever is accepted or acceptable, is either so from its own intrinsecal value, and then as such it cannot be acceptable beyond its worth; or from its Usefulness and Aptitude unto its Ends. I know a little in another sence may be accepted as a testimony of thankfull resentments of favours, or an acknowledgement of distance, duty, subjection, *&c.* but this is not to the Case in hand, is [acceptable] but as expressive of the temper and purpose of the Heart, were but the ability answerable to the heart? And then we must consider the Nature and Degree of its mediate usefulness; as also its consistency with other means at hand, or instituted; for if it cannot be used, but some better Means, and more gratefull to him that is most concerned in the End that must be prosecuted and attained unto, must be neglected, it cannot be acceptable. And hereupon 'tis worth considering, how far their voluntary or imposed Satisfactions justle out those needfull Exercises and Duties that in Society must be done, and all those exemplary and Encouraging Influences which we are bound to give to others by our own chearfulness, praise and joy in the possession and improvement of what we doe and may enjoy with God, and for him: Or it must be judged acceptable from some clear and grounded Testimonies and assurances from God, either mediate or immediate, that he will accept our voluntary Offerings as Satisfaction; and under the discovered Notion and respects in which the Ruler tells us they shall be accepted, we must use and offer them. Now it is plain, that whatever God exacts from us, is to be referred to either his Authority, and so it must be done as Duty; or to his Wisdom, and so it must be done by vertue of that proper tendency it hath unto its End, and then the End must give the just proportion to the Action, and also Duty cannot be avoyded in the Case. For should Gods Councels be neglected, we make reflections upon his Wisdom, and tell him, That though he hath advised us to such a way or course, yet we have discovered another course as good; and if we quit Gods councel and espouse our own, we practically tell him, that our way is better; and then that will prove strange Satisfaction, and *humane* with a witness, that hath contempt of God and his Advice inviscerated in it, or wrapt up in its bowels: Or it must be referred unto his Holiness, and so it must be expressive of his Image upon our Hearts. And what Relation the matter of meer Humane Satisfactions have hereto, (besides that shew, *Col.*2.23.) it will be hard to prove: Or it must relate unto his Covenant, Compassions, Grace and Love, and so be performed as its Condition, and then that doth import Command, and something more. And therefore, (2) Gratuitous Acceptation doth hold out something in the very Name and Notion, that might most justly be refuseable even as Satisfaction, and speaks a retreat in God from what he justly might demand, though

Satisfaction

Satisfaction were admitted and concluded on; which they themselves allow, by their distinguishing it from that Satisfaction which hath respect to rigorous Justice. (3) Many things are excluded from being Satisfaction, from the consideration of their being commanded, as things that must be done, as ever we hope for Life and Glory. As 1. Whatever hath a true and proper reference to Gods Glory, 1 *Cor.* 10. 31. And 2. Whatever doth promote, become, and is expressive of our universal powerful Love to God and Man, *Mat.* 22. 37,——40. And 3. Whatever as to the Matter of it is true or honest, just or pure, lovely, or of good report, and that hath either prayse or vertue, *Phil.* 4. 8, 9. it is a comprehensive claim. 4. Whatever is proportionable or suitable in Measure and Circumstances, to our Abilities, Places, Gifts, and Offices, 1 *Cor.* 7. 17. 1 *Pet.* 4. 10, 11. And thus to Fear God, and keep his Commandments, is the whole of Man, and in these things must he be tryed for Life or Death at last, *Eccles.* 12. 13. And now when these things are discharged, there will be little left for Satisfaction-work; and I believe it will put them sorely to it, for to name any thing under present circumstances, that is materially worthy of a Man or Christian, that can escape the Claim and Discipline of these Commandments, especially if you take in that comprehensive Text, *Tit.* 2. 12. and well consider the special indispensible Duties of every Relation, in Families, Church, and State, and also what we are bound to doe to credit Christianity, and to promote its interest, influences, and repute, to the Recovery and Salvation of all about us. These things shall be accepted by Gods favourable Condescension, in order to our everlasting Happiness on the account of Christ, as readily, heartily and effectually, as if we had never sinn'd, or satisfied for our sins our selves, notwithstanding all former Laws, and provocations to the contrary. Duty discharged is gratefull to God, and Gods commanding Will is satisfied, as far as things commanded are performed. And the fulfilling of fœderal Conditions do satisfie and are available to the estating of us in Covenant Rights and Priviledges, as far as the Covenant of Grace hath made them forcible and pleadable to these ends.

No works of ours could joyn with this that Christ did undertake and do for his Satisfaction as of it self entire, compleat and successfull.

And no other satisfactions can be, in whole or in part, necessary and available to procure this Covenant of Grace, and make the mercifull, moderate, gracious conditions thereof required of us, to be performed by us, so pleadable and effectual to their Ends in our Recovery and Salvation, as Christ hath made them. And they, if they would leave their Clouds, and face us in the open light, might see, that Satisfaction, if Humane, which they talk of so much, cannot be found in sence, if any thing be meant thereby, save pleasing God in doing his Will, and answering those Proposals, and fulfilling those Conditions on which we may attain and reap the Benefits of Christs Satisfaction; which Conditions would not have done our work, had not Christ by vertue of his Satisfaction deserved and obtained of God to give us Life upon such low and gracious terms; and how then can they find another sence or place for

Satis-

Satisfaction by their works? let them but freely tell us where it lies, that any works of ours can be ſatisfactory, and for what they can be ſo: As to the firſt, wherein their value for Satisfaction lies, let them deal freely with us. Is it by ſomething derived from Chriſt or not? if not, they had been as available as now they are, if Chriſt had never dyed for us; for the ſubſtance of eternal Puniſhments may now be done away, and their Eternity had been nothing without their Subſtance; for the Eternity of that which is not, is but a meer Chimæra: And as to Death, that univerſally and unavoidably entailed ſtroke on all, Patience and Voluntarineſs would have ſatisfied, but for what? not for the ſtroke, for that is born, and who would ſatisfie for what he cannot eſcape by Satisfaction? is it not hard to pay ſomething equivalent, and bear the ſtroke withall? for Satisfaction is not *ejuſdem* but *æquivalentis*; and if it be ſome worſe puniſhment, he that deſtroyes the Subſtance of the Puniſhment, need never fear the Eternity thereof, although there ſhould be no Satisfaction; but this will need no further confutation. If then the value of our works for Satisfaction be derived from Chriſt, it is either done by his Allowance, or by his Ordination, or by meer Advice: if by meer Allowance, this is no more than Lawfulneſs by bare permiſſion; and if this be enough to make a Satisfaction, then every thing neither commanded nor forbidden will do the work: And this abſurdity needs no loads, it being unable to bear it ſelf; but if it be by Ordination from Chriſt, where is the Order? what is the place and quality thereof? is it inſtrumentally cauſal? then let them ſhew wherein. Is it as a Condition conſtituted in a Covenant-way? where then is the Covenant that can make it ſo, and hath entailed this Promiſe on it? Is it by meer and bare Advice? if ſo, all councel doth reſult from skill, and wiſdom, and kindneſs too, in either reality or pretence: If therefore ſuch works be inexpedient means, there is no Friendſhip nor Wiſdom in the Caſe; for nothing can be adviſed by Wiſdom that is not adviſeable in the caſe; for this muſt be reſolved into Will, not Wiſdom: *Sic volo, ſic jubeo*; and then it ceaſes to be at our liberty, becauſe it is commanded: And if it be expedient in the Caſe, 'tis either ſo by abſolute Order, and then Neglect is ſinfull; or proper Tendency, and then God hath made it ſo; and Chriſts advice is the diſcovery of his Fathers will, and then Gods Authority makes it Duty, and our great and abſolute Concernment makes it neceſſary; and thus, *arbitrary* can it no longer be. For I am bound to take the moſt proper and expedient courſe and way to bring about my beſt Concernments and Deſigns, as far as they are laid within the compaſs of my utmoſt poſſible Knowledge. And therefore, here I am under Duty and Commandment ſtill; and if I can ſerve God better by Vows of Poverty, Chaſtity, *&c.* or any other Evangelical Counſels, than otherwiſe: the Male of the Flock ought to be offered up to God, and given him; and 'tis a ſtrange courſe for Satisfaction, to take a meaner and more improper courſe, when other wayes are made my Duty. I cannot be allowed to ſatisfie for Puniſhment by the

neglect of Duty, or by remissness in it. Nor can it be imagined by me, what references the imposed visiting of the Shrines of Saints, or such a Number of *Ave's* or *Pater Nosters*, can have to compensate my faults to God, seeing Apostate and depraved Man had rather travel far, and say a many Prayers (as being truely and apparently a more easie task, and in the eyes of wicked men readily taken so to be) than to leave sins and fall to thorow duty here, or bear the flames of Hell for ever, yea or in Purgatory, were there such a state and place. Nor are these courses likely to prevail on others for timely, universal and effectual Reformation and Conversion. And for the second, for what they can satisfie; this will bring us to consider the second general head.

Secondly, What they conclude either by *Concession* or *Denyal*. And here they grant that Christ hath satisfied for sins before Baptism, Original and Actual; for *mortal* sins after Baptism, for the Eternity of Punishment, for our former incapacity of making Satisfaction, which is deducible from this, in that they make such grace so necessary to our capacity of making Satisfaction, as could not come upon us unless Christ had satisfied before, namely, 1. The Grace of Justification, whereby the Spirit dwells in us, makes one with Christ, and interested in his Satisfaction, from whence that merit is derived into our works, that makes them to be Satisfactions too, though in relation to another head, *viz.* Gratuitous Acceptation. 2. The Grace of Evangelical Counsels, whereby something is rendred undue from us to God as being not commanded. 3. The grace of Remission, making eternal punishments temporal, to make our Satisfaction easie, and then 'tis plain, our *venial* sins and temporal Punishments may be satisfied for together, and with ease and great success by us.

To this I answer: All this hath been considered before, and answered, and therefore my weary thoughts and Pen shall close with some Reflections upon temporal Punishments and Satisfactions for them; and therefore (passing by Purgatory, as considered by another) temporal Punishments are either such absolutely, are entailed 1 Upon *all*, as Death, and that is considerable as to its stroke or sting: Or, 2. only upon *some*, and that as either consequent upon their own miscarriage in a natural or legal sence, or meerly resulting from the wise but arbitrary Providence of God: And thus my replyes are these. (1) Nothing that Christ hath done, or Man can doe, can make us hope, conclude or think, the stroke of Death can be avoyded, *Rom.* 5. 12. *Heb.* 9. 27. *Job* 30. 23. For God hath no where promised that. (2) As to the Sting of Death, Covenant grace and Faithfulness, through Christ, can only pluck out that. Reflections upon Grace and Faithfulness at a dying hour, can only make our Souls triumph over their sorrowes, fears and jealousies, through the Apprehensions of our approaching Judgement and Retributions in an eternal State. Nor can I think that any will find relief at last from Pilgrimages, Shrines and Scourges, &c. if this Grace and Faithfulness be wanting. (3) As to

Strokes conſequent upon our own miſcarriages, through our intemperance or imprudence, or miſdemeanours in reference to the Lawes of of God or Man. Our Temperance, Providence and Innocence through Gods good hand upon us, may prevent them as to their ſtrokes, and full Repentance, Faith and Holineſs may poſſibly allay, if not remove their bitterneſs and ſtrokes. (4) As to the Strokes that come by the arbitrary Providence of God, as the beſt men may not ſcape them, ſo Covenant-Faithfulneſs ſhall not loſe by them.

And thus you ſee by what is ſaid already, the ſence and grounds of what is controverted betwixt the Church of *Rome* and Us about this head of *Humane Satisfaction*, and thence you may gather what to ſay to what this Controverſie may be ſummed up in: The ſumme whereof lies in theſe following things, which they aſſert. As,

1. That all thoſe Afflictions and Temporal Chaſtnings which God inflicts on men with reference to their Graces, Sins, and exemplary uſefulneſs, are true Expiations of, and Satisfactions for their ſins paſt to Divine Juſtice. To which 'tis anſwered, 1. God ſatisfies himſelf in what he doth, in that his ſtrokes are grounded, proper, and ſucceſſefull to his Ends, to ſhew his Name, to execute his Laws, and ſo prevent all inconveniencies to his Name and Government. 2. They that endure theſe Strokes, and make a right improvement of them, do ſo far ſatisfie God, as ſatisfaction may ſignifie their pleaſing God, and anſwering his Ends in Diſcipline. 3. As far as this Improvement and regular bearing of Gods Diſcipline is a Condition of our eſcaping that ſmarter wrath which former ſins deſerved, ſo far the fulfilling hereof ſhall ſatisfie God, that is, anſwer his commanding and covenanting will ſo farre. But, 4. It is Chriſts Satisfaction only, and not any proper Merit in our ſufferings, as antecedent thereto, or abſtractedly conſidered therefrom, that makes our ſufferings of all kinds, and our carriage under them, available to theſe comfortable Ends and Iſſues of being pardoned and accepted.

2. That good Works, expreſſive of Repentance, Piety and Gratitude, and tending to promote Religion, Mortification, Self-denyal, *&c.* or preventive of further ſtrokes and Judgements, are truely ſatisfactory to God for ſin. *Anſw.* No further than as they, 1. Pleaſe God's ruling, his commanding and covenanting will (in which ſence God is ſatisfied but only as he is pleaſed:) And, 2. As Chriſt is conſidered in the caſe, to make them acceptable and available to obtain our Pardon and Recovery, and final Bliſs, by what he hath done and ſuffered and obtained for us.

3. That Penance impoſed by primitive Chriſtians upon the ſcandalous or Apoſtate, in order to their Cure and Readmiſſion to the Church with their conſent, and to their ſatisfaction, and other Chriſtian Ends, is now made a Satisfaction for their ſins to Juſtice. *Anſw.* God in Chriſt, and for his ſake, is ſo ſatisfied, (that is pleaſed) with our Repen-

tance, as our Obedience to his Command, our complyance with his Covenant-terms, our qualification in ſtate and temper for his further Image, Favour and Preſence, and all the Favours that conduce thereto, and reſult therefrom, and as our diſguſtings and bemoaning what hath been done amiſs, and preventing the lamentable Conſequences, of Impenitence, to both the Church and unbelieving World, as that where it is duely exerciſed and expreſs'd towards God and Man, in ſuch works as ordinarily and in ſpecial Caſes and Circumſtances, become Repentance, as that it ſhall ſuffice on their parts under Chriſt for their reſtoring to what their Scandals and Apoſtaſie bereaved them of. But it is only Chriſt that hath deſerved that our Repentance through Grace, and only Grace, ſhould reach theſe Ends and Benefits.

The ſumme of all is this, when we have abſtracted the Humane Satisfactions of the Papiſts from what God hath made our Duty, and the Condition of our Salvation, or from what is due to the Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt, from us as Creatures, Subjects, and delivered Sinners by Price and Power, to be trained up according to the Methods and Aſſiſtances of Goſpel Laws and Grace; and ſo from what I am bound to do to ſatisfie my injured and endammaged Neighbour, offended Governour, and the Church of Chriſt, according to the Inſtitutions, and for the neceſſary, and by God and Chriſt enjoyned Ends and Intereſt of the Goſpel; how narrow and uſeleſs will Humane Satisfactions appear to be?

And thus I have gone through this Task, as throughly, as Gods breaches on my Family, my manifold Diverſions, great Diſtractions, mean Abilities, and ſlender Furniture, and other Hinderances would admit of; and with my cloſing words, and to my laſt gaſp (if ſenſible ſo long) muſt I bewail the miſerable ſtate of Church and World, that muſt be ſcandalized, diſturbed, and divided, by wanton Fancies, prurient Wits, proud hearts, and ſiniſter deſigns, in having Doctrines clouded or ſophiſticated with dark and doubtfull words and phraſes impoſed on them.

SERMON

SERMON XXI.

There is no Tranſubſtantiation in the Lords Supper.

1 Cor. XI. 23, 24, 25.

For I have received of the Lord that which alſo I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jeſus, the ſame Night in which he was betrayed, took Bread.

And when he had given thanks he broke it, and ſaid, Take, eat, this is my Body, which is broken for you; this do in remembrance of me.

After the ſame manner alſo he took the Cup when he had ſupped, ſaying, This Cup is the New Teſtament in my Blood, this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.

GOD hath exalted Man above all Creatures of the viſible World, in giving him a Being capable of Religion, and thereby of Eternal Life and Happineſs in the enjoyment of himſelf. And to the end that God may make himſelf glorious, in making loſt Man happy, he hath in infinite Wiſdom and Grace given us his written Word, to be a perfect Rule of that Chriſtian Religion, (*a*) by which we may obtain Eternal Life and Happineſs in God by Chriſt; in which Word he hath not only revealed this glorious Happineſs to us, *and brought Life and Immortality to light, through the Goſpel*; (*b*) but alſo told us, what gives us a title unto, and fits us for, and the way that leads unto the full poſſeſſion of it.

And therefore what tongue can expreſs the deſperate madneſs and folly of thoſe men, who forſake *the good Word of the Grace of God*, (*c*) for a Religion that hath no other Foundation than the words of lying men.

And ſuch is the Popiſh-Religion, which as it is Popiſh, is deviſed only by

a *In his quæ aperte poſita ſunt in Scriptura, inveniuntur illa omnia quæ continent fidem, moreſque vivendi*, Aug. de Doctrina Chriſtiana lib. 2. cap. 9.

b 2 Tim. 1. 9.

c Act. 20. 32.

by Devils and Men, to feed lusts, and to serve a carnal and worldly Interest, and tends to the Damnation of millions of Sou's.

Their Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* in the Lords Supper, which I am now called to bear witness against, is one of the chief Articles of this Religion; and if this falls, their Idolatrous worshipping their Host, their most abhorred propitiatory Sacrificing Christ in their Mass, their Sacrilegious robbing the People of the Cup, and a great part of their Religion must fall with it; and yet by the Grace of God, I shall in this ensuing Discourse make it appear, that *Transubstantiation* is such an hideous Error, that the very nature and clear Consequences of it do crye
a Psal. 137.7. of the true Christian Religion, as they cryed of *Jerusalem*, (*a*) *Raze it, raze it, even to the foundation thereof.*

I shall therefore fall immediately to my work, which is to prove two things:

1. *That there is no Transubstantiation in the Eucharist or Lords Supper*; and take notice, that I do not question but the name *Eucharist* hath been anciently, and may be still fitly given to this Sacrament, but I shall choose to call it according to Scripture, the *Lords Supper*, it being better known among us by that Name.

2. *That it is Idolatry in the Papists to worship the consecrated Bread, though they think it is turn'd into the Body of Christ.*

Now because in these words (with those in the three Evangelists, *Matth.* 26. 26, 27, 28. *Mar.* 14. 22, 23, 24. *Luk.* 22. 19, 20, which I would be understood to take into my Text) the Institution of the Lords Supper is fully and clearly delivered from Christ to his Church, and because these words do carry us in a right line to the Author, and Nature, and Use, and Ends of this Ordinance; and are the true Standard by which we must try all Doctrines, and Opinions, and Practices touching the Lords Supper: and also because our Adversaries pretend to receive their Doctrine of Transubstantiation from Christ in these words: I have therefore chosen them for the most proper Subject of this Discourse.

And herein I shall proceed in this method.

1. I shall briefly acquaint you with the true Doctrine of the Lords Supper, taught by Christ in these words.

2. Acquaint you with the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, which the Papists pretend to receive from Christ in these words.

3. Prove that there is no Transubstantiation in the Lords Supper.

4. I shall make Application, and therein prove the second Proposition, viz. *That it is Idolatry in the Papists to worship the consecrated Bread, though they think it be turned into the Body of Christ.*

First, I shall give you a brief and plain account of the Doctrine of the Lords Supper, taught us in these word, in six particulars, which I shall further improve in the following Discourse.

1. Jesus

1. Jesus Christ hath in infinite Wisdom and Love appointed Bread and Wine for this Sacrament; this is evident by those words, *Jesus took Bread, and he took the Cup*, wherein was *the Fruit of the Vine*: Our dying Lord being about to institute and administer the Lords Supper, in Order thereunto he solemnly *took Bread and Wine.*

2. It is the Will of Jesus Christ that Bread and Wine be blessed and consecrated by the Ministers of the Gospel, this Bread and Wine must be changed from that common use, which they had before Consecration, by being blessed to a holy and spiritual and Sacramental use: This appears by our Saviours practice recorded in the Text, *Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and he took the Cup and gave thanks:* The word εὐλογήσας, translated *blessed*, and εὐχαριστήσας, translated *gave thanks*, do here signifie the same thing, and do assure us, that Christ blessed the Bread and Wine, which obligeth all Ministers in this Case to do the same; and therefore saith the Apostle, 2 *Cor.* 10. 16. *The Cup of Blessing which we bless, and the Bread which we break,*--- meaning the Bread of blessing, which we bless and break; for both were blessed by our Saviour, and are to be blessed by his Ministers, and are thereby made *blessed Bread*, and *blessed Wine.*

3. It is the will of Jesus Christ, that this blessed Bread be broken by his Ministers; this was a holy Rite, or Action of Christ, recorded by the three Evangelists, and by St. *Paul* in the Text, which tells us, *he blessed the Bread, and brake it*; from which Sacred Rite, Expositors conceive, that this Sacrament is cal'd *breaking of Bread*, *Act.* 20. 6. and it is clear, that our Saviour made this Bread, as thus broken, to signifie *the Body of Christ, which is broken for us*; and therefore saith the Apostle, *It is broken Bread that is the Communion of the Body of Christ*, 1 *Cor.* 10. 16. And though I cannot stay to quarrel with the Papists for lighter matters, yet take notice of their bold Superstition in affronting Christ herein, by making their Bread into little round Wafers, and not breaking it, but putting it whole into the mouths of the Communicants.

4. Jesus Christ hath appointed that this *blessed Bread, and blessed Wine*, be administred to Believers; this is clear by our Saviours example mentioned in the Text, which tells us, that *the Bread which he took, and blessed, and brake, he gave to his Disciples*; *and the Cup which he took and blessed, he gave to them.* Jesus Christ administred the blessed Bread and blessed Wine in this Sacrament.

5. It is the command of Jesus Christ, that Believers *do take, and eat, and drink*, this blessed Bread, and blessed Wine; for Christ gave and administred them with a command to take, and eat, and drink them; the words are clear, *Take, eat, drink ye all of it*; which Command the Disciples obeyed, and did take, and eat and drink the blessed Bread and Wine which Christ gave them; and so we see this blessed Bread and Wine passing from Christ to his Disciples in the Lords Supper, and eaten

and

and drunk by them: And therefore Christians be sure to hold fast these two things in the Lords Supper.

(1.) Never yield to part with the Bread and Wine out of the Lords Supper, for they are blessed, *destroy them not, for a blessing is in them*; all the Blessings that come from the infinite Love of God in Christ by the Covenant of Grace, for the Salvation of Believers, are *in this blessed Bread, and blessed Wine*, and if ye lose the Bread and Wine, ye lose those blessings as conveyed by them.

(2.) Take and eat, and drink this Bread and Wine as the Bread of Blessing, and as the Cup of Blessing, take the Blessing that is offered with them, for it is the Blessing that makes this glorious Feast of the Lords Supper.

6. Jesus Christ hath declared the use, which this Bread and Wine are blessed, and consecrated unto; in these words, *This is my Body, or this is my Body which is given, or broken for you. This Cup is my Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many*, &c. *or, this Cup is the New Testament in my Blood.*

These words declare two main Uses, whereunto this Bread and Wine are blessed and consecrated.

(1.) To be Sacramental Signs, to signifie and represent to us Jesus Christ crucified, and all the Benefits of his Death; for the words do clearly speak of Christ crucified, and that with respect to us. *This is my Body which is broken for you; this Cup is the New Testament in my Blood which is shed for you.* And by Faith, whereby the Heart doth assent to the truth of these words, we do in this Ordinance discern the Lords Body broken for us, and his Blood shed for us, and have our Souls filled, and suitably affected with the holy knowledge and remembrance, and contemplation of Christ crucified for us.

(2.) To be a Seal to confirm the New Testament or Covenant of Grace, whereby Christ and all the Benefits of his Death are conveyed to Believers; this appears by these words, *This Cup is the New Testament, &c.* and by the Apostles Explication of the words, *This is my Body,--- this Cup is my Blood.* 1 *Cor.* 10. 16. *The Cup of Blessing which we bless, is it not the Communion of the Blood of Christ? and the Bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ?* Teaching us plainly, that by this blessed Bread and Wine, there is a Communication of the Body and Blood of Christ, and of all the Benefits of his Death, which Believers are made partakers of in the Lords Supper; and therefore we are commanded to take, and eat, and drink this blessed Bread and Wine, for this use also; which we do, not only by seeing Christ crucified as here represented to us, but also by accepting, and receiving, and feeding upon him by Faith as he is here offered to us, to be the most glorious Feast of our Souls. And although it is the great Duty of Believers to see and feed on Christ crucified, as revealed and offered to us in his Word, and by other Ordinances, yet this is proper

and

and peculiar to this Ordinance; for Believers to see and feed upon him, as he is represented and offered, and given in the appointed use of Bread and Wine.

And thus I have given you a plain and brief account of the Doctrine of the Lords Supper taught us by Christ in these words; and for your confirmation in the truth thereof, I shall commend three things to your serious consideration.

1. That for the Matter of this Feast, the Papists cannot with their Transubstantiation declare it to be greater, or more, or better than we do without it: For we say, Here is Christ and all that is purchased by his Blood; here is all that is revealed and conveyed to us from the infinite Love of God, by the Covenant of Grace; here is God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost in Covenant with us, to pardon our sins, and to bring us through Holiness unto Eternal Life and Happiness in Heaven.

2. For the Guests, or Communicants, we declare them to be the holy Society of true Believers, who are in Union with Christ as his blessed Bride, and Spouse, and Members.

3. We further declare, that all the glorious things of this Feast, are so far really present with these Guests, that their Souls do truely feed upon them, and are feasted with them, but there is no necessity of a local presence of the Objects of the Soul with the Faculties, to make up this Feast; but Believers are here feasted by the remembrance of Christs Death, which is above 1600 years past, and by their hopes of Glory in Heaven, and at the Day of Judgement, which is to come; and in seeing by Faith the crucified and glorified Body of Christ in that place and Order which the Scriptures reveal it to them, though his blessed Body be at a local distance from them. And so according to this Doctrine you see sufficient reason in all thankfulness to acknowledge, that the Lords Supper is such a Feast as is for the honour of the great *Jehovah*, to entertain his beloved Children and Friends withall on Earth, till he call them to feast for ever with him in Heaven, without the Use of Bread and Wine.

Secondly, I proceed to acquaint you with the Popish Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, which the Papists pretend to receive from Christ in these words: This Transubstantiation is declared in the Councel of *Trent* thus. (*a*) *That by the consecration of the Bread and Wine, there is made a Conversion of the whole substance of the Bread, into the substance of the Body of Christ, and a conversion of the whole substance of the Wine into the substance of his Blood, which conversion the catholick Church doth fitly and properly call Transubstantiation. And if any shall say, that in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, the substance of the Bread and Wine do remain, and shall deny this wonderfull and singular conversion of the whole substance of the Bread into the Body, and of the whole substance of the Wine into the Blood of Christ, the species of the Bread and Wine*

(*a*) *Concil. Trident. Sess. 13. cap. 4. can. 2.*

only remaining, which converſion the catholick Church doth very fitly call Tranſubſtantiation: Let him be accurſed.

But, ſaith *Solomon, Prov.* 26. 2. *As the bird by wandring, and as the Swallow by flying, ſo the curſe cauſeleſs ſhall not come*; And therefore let them *curſe*, but Lord *bleſs thou, Pſal.* 109. 28. For in defiance of their brutiſh Execrations, I do with deteſtation deny this monſtrous, and blaſphemous Doctrine; and do therefore proceed to the

Third particular, to prove, *That there is no Tranſubſtantiation in the Lords Supper*, which I ſhall prove by theſe following Arguments.

Firſt *Argument.* The Scripture is not for Tranſubſtantiation in the Lords Supper, but is fully againſt it, and condemns it; we have only the words of Papiſts for it, but there is not one tittle of the good Word of God for it; but although there is no Ordinance of Worſhip more fully and plainly delivered from Chriſt in the Scriptures, than this of the Lords Supper, yet therein is not the leaſt Foundation for Tranſubſtantiation, but God ſaith in effect of it as he did of that abomination of the *Jews, Jerem.* 7. 31. *---which I commanded not, neither came it into my heart*; and if it came not into Gods heart, God forbid that it ſhould ever come into our hearts.

That the Scripture is not for, but againſt Tranſubſtantiation, will appear by examining thoſe Scriptures, which our Adverſaries alleadge for it; and they are principally theſe two, *viz.* The words in the Text, *This is my body, this cup is my blood:* and *Joh.* 6. where our Saviour hath a large Diſcourſe *of eating his fleſh, and drinking his blood:* Now I ſhall vindicate both theſe Scriptures from the ſence of the Papiſts, and make it appear, that there is not in them the leaſt warrant for Tranſubſtantiation.

I ſhall begin with the firſt, which they chiefly inſiſt upon; and here take notice that their whole Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation is contained in theſe ſeven particulars, all which they pretend to prove from theſe words, *This is my body, this cup is my blood.*

1. They ſay that *conſecration* of the Bread and Wine is made by theſe words only. (*a*)

2. That by vertue of theſe words, the ſubſtance of the Bread and Wine are turned into the Body and Blood of Chriſt: and this is their Tranſubſtantiation.

3. That after theſe words are pronounced by the Prieſt, there is no ſubſtance of the Bread and Wine remaining in the Lords Supper.

4. That the *ſpecies* or Accidents only of the Bread and Wine do remain in the Lords Supper, and theſe do ſignifie the ſpiritual Feaſt, and are eſſential to this Sacrament. (*b*)

5. That by vertue of theſe words, the very material Body and Blood of Chriſt are locally and corporally preſent in the Lords Supper, and are contained under theſe *ſpecies* or Accidents of Bread and Wine. (*c*)

6. That

a Sententia communis non ſolum Theologorum recentiorum, ſed etiam veterum patrum, Chriſtum conſecraſſe illis verbis. Hoc eſt corpus meum, Hic eſt ſanguis meus *Bellarm. de Euchar. lib.* 4. *cap.* 13.

b *Bellarm. de Euchar. lib.* 4. *cap.* 6.

c *Concil. Trid. Seſſ.* 13. *cap.* 1. *can.* 1.

6. That with these *species* or Accidents of the Bread and Wine, the true, material Body and Blood of Christ are taken into the Mouths and Stomachs of the Communicants, and corporally eaten and drunk by them. (*d*)

Ult. That the plain and necessary sence of these words, *This is my body*, is this, *viz.* This Substance contained under the Accidents of Bread and Wine, is my Body. (*e*)

d *Bellarm. de Euchar. lib.* 1. *cap.* 11.

e *Bellarm. de Euchar. lib.* 1. *cap.* 11.

Now I shall make it appear, that all these are Popish Inventions, contrary to the mind of Christ in the words, and for that end I shall speak briefly in confutation of each of them.

(1.) To the first I say, that Consecration of the Bread and Wine is not made by these words, *This is my body, this cup is my blood*: but it is made by the Blessing of the Bread and Wine by Christ and his Ministers.

1. That Consecration is not made by these words is evident, because these words do speak of Bread and Wine already consecrated, or else they cannot be true; for it cannot be said truely of any Bread and Wine in the World, this *is* the Body, and this *is* the Blood of Christ, but only of blessed and consecrated Bread and Wine.

2. That consecration is made by the blessing of the Bread and Wine is also manifest; for it is by the Blessing that they are made blessed Bread, and blessed Wine, or else the Blessing was in vain, and Christ and his Ministers were not heard in the Prayers and Thanksgivings which they offered to God for a Blessing on those Elements; but if men would be concluded by Scripture, the Apostle doth fully decide this controversie, 1 *Cor.* 10. 16. *The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?* &c. where we see plainly, that it is the blessing of the Bread and VVine which makes them the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ.

(2.) They say, that by vertue of these words, *This is my body, this cup is my blood*, the substance of the Bread and VVine are turned into the Body and Blood of Christ, which conversion they call Transubstantiation.

I referre you to all my Arguments against Transubstantiation, to convince you of the falshood and odiousnes of this sence, only here take notice, that this cannot be the meaning of the words, for the words declare what the Bread and VVine are, *viz.* what they signifie, and not what they shall be when these words are pronounced, for it is not said, Let this Bread and VVine be turned into the Body and Blood of Christ, but *This is my body, this cup is my blood*; which words being an affirmation of a Truth, do affirm and report that which was a truth before the words are spoken, and not that which by the speaking of the words must be made true.

(3.) They say, that after these words are pronounced by the Priest, there remains no substance of the Bread and VVine in the Lords Supper.

This is ſuch a prodigious Errour, that they may as well ſay, that God would have all men turn Infidels and mad men, and go out of their ſenſes to become Chriſtians: but I ſhall here only give you three Reaſons againſt this Opinion, whereunto I ſhall adde more in the following Diſcourſe.

1. If theſe words deſtroy the ſubſtance of the Bread and VVine out of the Lords Supper, then Jeſus Chriſt did by theſe words fruſtrate and make voyd his own bleſſing of the Bread and VVine; and ſo did croſs his own will in praying for the Bleſſing, and his Fathers will in granting his prayer, for according to this Opinion, when Jeſus Chriſt by Prayer and Thankſgiving had bleſſed the Bread and VVine, he preſently utters words which makes them neither Bread and VVine, nor bleſſed; and thus they make Chriſt curſe his own bleſſing.

2. That Bread and VVine are in the Lords Supper, appears, becauſe Jeſus Chriſt himſelf did in this Ordinance adminiſter Bread and VVine to his Diſciples, and that with a command to them, to take, and eat, and drink Bread and VVine; which command the Diſciples obeyed, and did accordingly take, and eat, and drink them: for proof of this, weigh the words: *Jeſus took Bread, and bleſſed, and brake, and gave to his Diſciples, and ſaid, Take, eat, this is my body: In like manner he took the cup and gave thanks, and gave it to them, ſaying, Drink ye all of it, for this is my blood*, &c. Now *Bellarmine* (*a*) himſelf ſaith, "That it "cannot be doubted, but all theſe words, He took Bread, he bleſſed and "brake, and gave to his Diſciples; referre to the ſame matter of bread "which was in his hands. Seeing then that in our Saviours adminiſtration of the Lords Supper to his Diſciples, which is the ſtanding Rule and Pattern to all Miniſters and Chriſtians to the end of the world, we find Chriſt himſelf adminiſtring bread and wine, and ſee bread and wine paſſing in this Ordinance from Chriſt to his Diſciples, and Chriſt commanding them to eat and drink them; for what he gave, he commanded them to take and eat and drink; and they did accordingly take and eat the Bread, and take and drink the Wine. What prodigious folly and wickedneſs is this, to deny that Bread and Wine are in the Lords Supper?

(*a*) *Bellarm. de Euchar. lib.* 1. *cap.* 11.

3. The Apoſtle *Paul* himſelf doth no leſs than three times call it Bread after conſecration, and likewiſe tells us, that the Communicants do eat the bread, and drink the cup. See *v.* 26, 27, 28. *For as oft as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup,* ---- *Whoſoever ſhall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord,* ---- *Let a man examine himſelf, and ſo let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup.* See Chriſtians how the Papiſts do contradict and quarrel with the bleſſed Apoſtle: *Paul* ſaith, that the Communicants do oft eat this Bread, and drink this Wine in the Lords Supper: The Papiſts ſay, that they never eat bread, nor drink wine. *Paul* ſaith, Whoſoever ſhall eat this bread, and drink this cup: The Papiſts ſay, No man doth ever eat this bread, nor drink this cup. *Paul* ſaith,

Let

Let him eat this bread, and drink this cup: The Papists say, Let him not eat this bread, nor drink this cup. See, I say, the difference betwixt God and the Apostle on the one hand, and the Pope and Papists on the other hand; and choose whether ye will believe, for if God be to be believed before the Papists, there is bread and wine in the Lords Supper.

There are several Objections which the Papists make against this last Reason, I shall onely instance in two of the chief of them.

1 *Object.* The Scripture calls it bread, because it was once bread, as after *Moses* his Rod was turn'd into a Serpent, it is still called a Rod, *Exod.* 7. 12. and after the water was turn'd into wine, yet it is still cal'd water, *Joh.* 2. 9. So say they, after this bread is turned into the body of Christ it is still cal'd bread, because it was bread before this conversion was made.

Answ. The Scripture calls the Serpent a Rod, because that which was then a Serpent was before a Rod; and the Wine is called Water, because that which was then wine was water a little before; but Christs body never was bread, and therefore there is not the like Reason to call it bread.

2 *Object.* The Scripture often calls things not from their Nature, but from their outward Appearance to us. So the Angels that appeared to *Abraham* in the Likeness of Men are called Men, *Genes.* 18. and so because this hath the outward appearance of bread, therefore the Scripture calls it bread: This is *Bellarmines* Objection. (*a*)

Answ. As the Scripture calls it bread before consecration, because it is so, and hath the true Nature and Properties of bread, so it calls it bread after consecration, not because it is like bread, but because it is bread; for consecration doth bless the thing consecrated, but never destroyes it: and therefore this Objection is vain, because these Angels never were Men, nor had the beings of men, but only appeared in the likeness of Men; but this had the true substance of bread before consecration, as our Adversaries grant, and hath the true substance of bread after consecration, as we have proved, and for that Reason both before and after the Scripture calls it bread.

a *Bellarm. de Eucar. lib* 1. *cap.* 14.

(4.) They say, that the *species* or Accidents only of the bread and wine remain in the Lords Supper, and these do signifie the body and blood of Christ, and are essential to this Sacrament: by *species* or Accidents is meant the colour, smell, sweetness, length, breadth, moysture, *&c.* of the bread and wine, and these, say they, ye see, taste, feel, smell, eat and drink, but ye do not see, nor taste, nor smell, nor touch, nor eat, nor drink Bread and Wine.

I shall only at present say two things against this Opinion:

1. This as our Divines well argue, is a plain contradiction, for the essence and being of Accidents is to be inherent in the Subjects which they are Accidents of; or else they subsist by themselves, and so are not Accidents.

Accidents but Subſtances; to inſtance in the preſent caſe: If there be whiteneſs, and redneſs, and length, and breadth, and heavineſs, there muſt be ſome ſubſtance that is white, and red, and long, and broad, and heavy; or elſe the communicants muſt in the Lords Supper ſolemnly eat, and drink white, and red, and long, and broad, and heavy nothing.

2. There is the ſame Reaſon to deny that the *accidents* of Bread and Wine do remain in the Lords Supper, as to deny that the *ſubſtance* of them do remain there, for if theſe words, *This is my body, this cup is my blood*, do deſtroy the *ſubſtance*, certainly they muſt deſtroy *the accidents* too, for they are pronounced over the whole bleſſed bread and wine, and make no diſtinction between *the ſubſtance and accidents*, but ſpeak the ſame of both together. And therefore I ſhall here expoſtulate this caſe with our Adverſaries thus: when our Lord Jeſus bleſſed the brea dand wine, did he bleſs *the ſubſtance* with one kind of bleſſing, and *the accidents* with another? did his bleſſing on the Subſtance deſtroy it, and the ſame bleſſing on the Accidents preſerve them? Or when Chriſt ſaid, *This is my body, this cup is my blood*, can they perſwade themſelves, that he therein ſaid one thing of *the ſubſtance*, and another thing quite contrary of *the accidents*? So that by vertue of theſe words, the Subſtance of bread and wine is turned into the body and blood of Chriſt, and the Accidents of bread and wine are preſerved without the *ſubſtance*, and appointed to ſignifie his body and blood; or if by vertue of theſe words *the ſubſtance* be deſtroyed, by vertue of what words are *the accidents* preſerved, and conſecrated to a uſe quite contrary to the uſe of the Subſtance? If they ſay, Their ſenſes tell them, the Accidents remain there, we ſay and ſhall make it appear, that their ſenſes and ours alſo tell us and them, that *the ſubſtance with the accidents* remain there alſo, and if Faith muſt conclude againſt the ſenſes in the caſe *of the ſubſtance*, why muſt it not alſo conclude againſt the ſenſes in the caſe of *the accidents*? but if again t Scripture, and Reaſon, and Senſe, the Papiſts will uſurpa Power to keep and deſtroy what they pleaſe in this Sacrament, let us keep our *Lords Supper*, and let them take their *Popes Supper*.

(5.) They ſay, that by vertue of theſe words, the very material *body* and *blood* of Chriſt are locally and corporally preſent in the Lords Supper, and are contained under the Accidents of Bread and Wine.

I might plead many Arguments againſt this, but I muſt remember that I am limited in my work, and ſhall therefore give you onely one Argument to convince you of the falſeneſs and madneſs of this Opinion, and that is this.

Arg. If theſe words, *This is my body, this cup is my blood*, &c. do make the *body* and *blood* of Chriſt to be locally and corporally preſent in the Lords Supper, then his Body crucified and dead upon the croſs, and his Blood there ſhed out of his veins, are locally and corporally preſent in the Lords Supper. Obſerve Chriſtians where theſe mens Principles lead them; I know our Adverſaries do confeſs, that the body of Chriſt is no where

where found dead since his Resurrection, and therefore saith *Bellarmine*, (a) *God doth not cause, nor ever will cause to all Eternity, that the Body of Christ be any where found dead*; yet I say, it doth necessarily follow this Doctrine, that his body is found dead upon the Cross, and his blood there shed in the Lords Supper; for if these words do make his body and blood locally and corporally present under the *species* of bread and wine as they affirm, then it must be his body and blood as these words do expressely declare, this is my body *broken for you*, this cup is *my blood shed for the Remission of the sins of many*; which words do clearly speak of his body crucified, and dead, and of his blood shed upon the Cross; and therefore the Apostle doth teach us, that in this Ordinance we *do shew forth the Lords death*; so that nothing can be more clear, than that by this Doctrine the bread and wine are turned into the dead body of Christ, and into his blood shed upon the Cross, and that his body crucified and dead upon the Cross, with his blood there shed, are locally and corporally present under the Accidents of bread and wine: And so by this Doctrine, Christs body was really and actually dead upon the Cross, and so present under the Accidents of bread and wine, when at the first Institution and Administration of the Lords Supper, he said, This is my body *given*, or *broken for you*; and this is my *blood shed*, &c. And also in despite of the Apostle, that saith, *Rom.* 6. 9. *Christ being raised from the dead, dieth no more*; his body must be dead upon the Cross, and as so dead, must be locally and corporally present in the Lords Supper, under the Accidents of bread and wine, whensoever or wheresoever this Sacrament hath been, or shall be administred since his Resurrection to his coming to Judgement. And moreover, it must also follow from this Doctrine, that the very material Cross on which Christ was crucified, and all the Instruments of his Death, must be locally and corporally present at the Lords Supper, and the very Souldier that pierced him must be there present, piercing his side with a Spear; yea, the very hour of his Death, though so many years past, and the place of his death, so many miles distant, must be present in every time and place the Lords Supper is administred. Christians, these consequences are not forced, but these, and an hundred more such wild contradictions do necessarily follow this Doctrine, as appears to any who will but grant, that which cannot be denyed, *viz.* That these words, This is my body *which is broken for you*, this cup is *my blood shed for many*, do directly point at the body of Christ crucified and dead upon the Cross, with the manner, and all the instruments and circumstances of his death, as recorded by the Evangelists in the History of his Passion.

(a) Deus non facit, nec est futurus aeternum, ut Christi corpus alicubi reperiatur mortuum. *Bellarm. de Euchar lib. 4. cap. 21.*

(6.) They say, that with these *species* or Accidents of *bread* and *wine*, the true material body and blood of Christ are taken into the mouths and stomachs of the Communicants, and corporally eaten and drunk by them.

I have three things to say against this odious and barbarous Doctrine.

1. It

1. It asserts that which is *impossible.*
2. That which is *unprofitable* both to Soul and Body.
3. That which is *impious* and *flagitious.*

First, This Opinion asserts a multitude of *impossibilities* and *contradictions*, and that in a very great and weighty point of Religion; now that ye may understand the strength of these kind of Arguments, take notice, That when two things are affirmed that are altogether inconsistent, so that one of them fully destroyes the truth of the other; and if one be true, the other must necessarily be false; this is an impossibility, or contradiction; as to affirm, that the same man is dead and alive at the same time, is a contradiction, because he cannot be dead of a natural death, and live a natural life at the same time. Now I say in this Opinion of corporal eating the *body*, and drinking the *blood* of Jesus Christ, is a multitude of most horrid contradictions, which are found in three cases.

1. In the case of *Jesus Christ*, his eating and drinking the Lords Supper, for our Adversaries agree with us, that Jesus Christ did eat and drink the Lords Supper.

2. In the case of the *Disciples*, at the first Administration of this Ordinance.

3. In the case of all *Communicants* ever after.

(1.) In the case of *Jesus Christ*, his eating and drinking the Lords Supper; I shall here onely instance in three plain and grosse contradictions.

1. That Jesus Christ, did with his *body* eat his own whole *body*, and yet his body continue as it was before whole and uneaten, and so the same body was eaten and not eaten at the same time, and the Eater and that which is eaten is every way the same, and that which was eaten did eat the body, which was the Eater of it, in the same Action, and at the same time.

2. That the same *sacred body* of Jesus Christ was in all its dimensions and proportions, sitting at the Table in the view of his Disciples, and yet was at the same time in his own mouth and stomack, and so either this one body of Christ was multiplyed into two, *viz.* one within the other; or else the same whole body, and flesh, and bones, was inclosed in a little part of his own body.

3. That Jesus Christ did drink his own precious *blood*, and that the same material blood of Christ was shed, and was in the cup, and did pass out of the cup into the mouth and stomach of our Lord, and yet at the same time his blood not shed, neither did move out of his veins. These are most filthy, odious, and hideous contradictions.

(2.) There are many contradictions in the case of the *Disciples*, who by this Doctrine are said corporally to eat and drink the material Body and

and Blood of Christ, at the Institution and first Administration of the Lords Supper: For either they did eat and drink his body and blood, as he was then alive, before his death; or as dead and crucified with his blood shed on the Cross; or as glorified in Heaven, or as all these together. Now in every one of these there are many horrid contradictions.

1. If they say, that they did eat and drink his body and blood as he was alive before his death, then there are these two contradictions therein.

First, That his whole body was sitting at the Table with his Disciples, and also in the Mouths and Stomachs of his Disciples at the same time, and so every Disciple had the same whole body in his Stomach, which they all saw sitting before them at the Table.

Secondly, That his Blood was shed out of his body, and taken into the mouths and stomachs of his Disciples, and yet not shed but continued within his own body at the same time.

2. If they did eat his *body* dead and crucified upon the Cross, and and corporally drink his *blood* there shed; then his *body* was dead and crucified on the Cross, and dead in their Stomachs, and alive at the Table at the same time.

3. If they did corporally eat his glorified *body*, and drink the *blood* of his glorified body; then his body was glorified in Heaven after his death, and as such was in the Disciples Stomachs, and yet at the same time was upon Earth in the state of his Humiliation before his death.

4. If they did eat his *body* and drink his *blood* as alive, and dead and glorified, and so considered altogether; then his body was really alive before his death, and dead upon the Cross, and glorified in Heaven, and in all these cases, in the Mouths and Stomachs of his Disciples at the same time. These and many such blasphemous Contradictions are in the Disciples corporally eating the body, and drinking the blood of Jesus Christ.

(3.) There are also many plain and horrid contradictions in the case of all *Communicants* eating and drinking the body and blood of Christ, under the *species* of Bread and Wine, since the Institution and first Administration of this Ordinance. I shall only instance in this one.

That one and the same *body* of Christ which is a finite being, should be wholly in Heaven, and at the same time wholly under the Accidents of Bread and Wine in the Lords Supper, whereseever it is administred, and no where else in the World, and that this one body in Heaven should be wholly present with these Accidents, in all the Mouths of the many thousand Communicants in *Rome*, *Spain*, *France*, *England*, and in all other parts of the World where this Sacrament is administred; doth speak as many Contradictions as there are communicants in the world, and all as impossible, as it is for the same particular man to be preaching in a Pulpit at *Rome*, and at the same time to be preaching the same Sermon in all the Pulpits of the World. And thus I have shewed you, that

this corporal eating the Body, and drinking the Blood of Jesus Christ with the *species* or Accidents of bread and Wine, is *impossible*.

Secondly, It is *unprofitable*, and doth neither good to Soul nor Body. This appears by our Saviours words, *Joh.* 6. 63.---- *The flesh profiteth nothing.*---- That is, the corporal eating the flesh of Christ profiteth nothing; and that this is our Saviours meaning, is evident; because it is the design of our Saviour in the foregoing words, to shew the Necessity, and the great Profit and Advantage of eating and drinking the *body* and *blood* of Christ spiritually by Faith; the Necessity hereof is expressed, *Vers.* 53. *Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no Life in you*; and this (saith Christ) is Profitable, as the Means of our Union with him, *Vers.* 56. *He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him*; and is also profitable to Eternal Life, and Happiness, *Vers.* 54. *Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath Eternal Life, and I will raise him up at the last day.* Now the *Jews* were startled at his words, understanding that he meant a corporal eating of his flesh, and therefore say they, *Vers.* 52. *How can this man give us his flesh to eat?* This was such a Mistake as that of *Nicodemus*, *Joh.* 3. 3, 4. who when our Saviour spake of the Necessity of being born again, he wondered, and said, *How can an old man be born? can he enter the second time into his Mothers womb, and be born?* And the Disciples themselves understanding our Saviour in that gross and carnal sence of corporal eating his flesh, were offended, and said, *v.* 6. *This is an hard saying, who can hear it?* And therefore Christ explains his words, *v.* 63. *It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the Flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I speak unto you are spirit, and are life:* That is, my words as you mistake them for a corporal eating my flesh, and drinking my blood, are not true; for the eating my flesh so profiteth nothing, but that eating my flesh, and drinking my blood by Faith in a spiritual manner, will make you blessed for ever; and so my words which I speak of this matter, are Spirit, and they are Life; and hereby it is manifest to all but such who study to corrupt and pervert the Scriptures, that our Saviour himself tells us, that corporal eating his flesh, and drinking his blood, is altogether unprofitable. And I say it neither doth good to Body nor Soul.

1. It doth no good to the *body*, for it doth neither gratifie the Palate, nor allay or satisfie hunger or thirst, nor turns into any bodily nourishment, and so hath no use or property of bodily food.

2. It doth no good to the Souls, either of the Wicked, or of the Godly.

(1) It doth no good to the Souls of the Wicked, as our Adversaries themselves confess; and yet they will have this glorious *body* and precious *blood* of Christ to be taken corporally into the blasphemous mouths, and into the open Sepulchres of the throats of Swearers, and into the beastly

beastly mawes or stomachs of Drunkards and Gluttons; and within the rotten bodies of Whoremongers and Harlots, and there to lodge till the Accidents of bread and wine be digested, and then to remove no body knowes whither, leaving the cursed Inhabitants no better than he found them.

(2) Neither doth this corporal eating the *flesh*, or drinking the *blood* of Christ do any good to the Souls of the Godly, it kills no Sin, begets or quickens no Grace, yields no comfort, and indeed is not desireable to any wise and holy Christian, who never hungers and thirsts to have the body and blood of Christ in his mouth and stomach: Neither is it Christs way by entering into the mouths, and going down into the stomachs of his People to feed and feast their Souls; but *Christ is spiritually formed in their hearts*, *Gal.* 4. 19. and the Spirit doth *glorifie Christ in them*, *Joh.* 16. 14. and by the word and Sacraments their souls are feasted with the remembrance of his death, and with seeing him by faith *crowned with honour and glory* in heaven, *Heb.* 2. 9. and in their joyfull expectation of all the benefits of his death and resurrection, and intercession in the holy and blessed world; but the bodies of believers shall never meet the body of Christ till *they meet the Lord in the air, and so to be for ever with the Lord*, 1 *Thes.* 4. 17. but for this doctrine of the corporal presence of Christ in the mouths and stomachs of men which the frantick Papists would make us believe, it is a doctrine fitter to make our hairs stand an end, than to feed our souls, and is good for nothing, but to make the Popish Religion odious to all wise, and sober Christians.

Thirdly, I have this further to charge on this doctrine, that it teacheth a practice most horribly *impious* and *flagitious*: for to feed on mans flesh, and to drink mans blood was ever accounted a most barbarous transgression of all the rules of piety and humanity, and therefore this must be the height of that kind of impiety, to eat the sacred flesh, and to drink the precious blood of Christ in a corporal manner, which the Popish Can nibals teach men to practise; and which they pretend to prove both from the Text, and from *Joh.* 6. Against which odious sence, holy *Austin* pleads the same Argument, which I now use, saying, (*a*) "If there be a "Precept forbidding Sin, and commanding Good, it is not then a figu- "rative speech, but if it seem to command a horrible wickedness, or "forbid that which is profitable, then it is a figurative speech; and he "gives this Example in *Joh.* 6. 53. *Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of* "*Man*---- This (*saith he*) seems to command a most heinous wickedness, "and therefore it is a figurative speech, commanding us to communicate "with the sufferings of our Lord, and sweetly and profitably to lay up "this in our memories, that his flesh was crucified, and wounded for us.

a August. de Doctrina Christiana. *lib* 3. *cap.* 15, 16.

But the Papists proceed in their Blasphemy, and are not ashamed to tell us, that if Dogs, or Mice, or Rats, or Worms, do eat the consecrated Host, they do therewith eat the body of Christ; and therefore according to their Wisdom they have provided in their Missal, (*b*) That if Rats,

b Can 39. glossa in Can. 2. *de Consecratione.*

or Worms, do eat the body of Christ, they must be burned; what for Hereticks? because their senses took it only for Bread? but if their Host be not God, why do they worship him with Divine Worship? and if he be God, why will they cast their God into the fire?

And *Tho. Aquinas* their Angelical Doctor, as they call him, (and of whom they tell us this tale, that his Doctrine of the Sacrament was confirmed by this Miracle; a Wooden Crucifix miraculously saluted him with these words, *Benè scripsisti de me Thoma*, Thou hast written well of me *Thomas*) doth assert and plead for this dirty Ribauldry, saying, (*c*) That it doth no more detract from the Dignity of Christ to be eaten by Dogs and Mice, than his being willing to be crucified for our Sins. A goodly Argument for such an acute Schoolman; as if because Jesus Christ in the state of his Humiliation was willing to be crucified for our sins, therefore in the state of his Exaltation, he is willing that his glorified body in Heaven should be eaten by Dogs and Mice: but thus they talk, as if their Doctors had sate in the Council with Devils in the Gates of Hell, to debauch the Faith of Christians, and to disgrace the body of Christ.

c *Aquin.* sum. part. 3. quæst. 80. art. 3.

Lastly, They say, that the plain and necessary sence of these words, *This is my Body*, is this, this substance contained under the Accidents of Bread is my Body.

What I have already spoken to the former particulars doth fully conclude against this sence; and yet I shall here adde two things against it.

1. That this sence is inconsistent with their own Doctrine.
2. That it is repugnant to the true, and plain, and necessary sence of Christ in the words.

(1.) That this sence is inconsistent with their own Doctrine, appears in two particulars.

1. In their forcing two different, and both false sences on these words, *This is my body, viz.* this substance contained under the Accidents of bread is my body, and these Accidents of Bread do signifie my body; and so the word *This* must both mean, *this substance*, viz. Christs body, and also *these Accidents of Bread*, and the word *is* must both be *is properly and essentially my body*, and is *figuratively and significatively the Sign of my body*.

d *Bellarm.* de Euchar. lib 1. cap. 11.
e De Euchar. lib. 4. cap. 5.

I know *Bellarmine* (*d*) sometimes grants, that it is truly most absurd, to say that by the word *This*, is meant *these Accidents*: yet the same *Bellarmine* tells, (*e*) "That the Accidents of Bread and Wine do signifie "the spiritual Feast, meaning as he explains himself, the body and blood "of Christ, and that the Accidents of bread and wine, as well as the body "and blood of Christ, do pertain to the essence of this Sacrament: Now that they force this sence on these words, is clear, because all their pretended Miracles in the Lords Supper, whereof the preserving the Accidents without the Substance is one, are with them effected by vertue of

these

these words, and also because Consecration, one Effect whereof must be to consecrate the Accidents of bread, to signifie the Body of Christ, is in their sence made by these words: So that it is evident, that they distort these words, *This is my body*, to both these sences, this Substance contained under the Accidents of bread is my body; and these Accidents of bread do signifie my body; which are so inconsistent, that all the Rope of Popes, can never be able to tie them together.

2. This sence is inconsistent with their Doctrine, which teacheth, that the substance of the bread is turned into the body of Christ by vertue of these words: And saith *Bellarmine*, (*f*) in the last moment when all these words are spoken, then this Conversion is made; now to say, that the Conversion of the Bread into the body of Christ is not made till all these words are spoken, and yet to say, that the first word *this* doth demonstrate Christs body, are plainly inconsistent.

(*f*) De Euchar. lib. 2. cap. 11.

(2.) I proceed to prove, that this sence is repugnant to the true and plain, and necessary sence of Christ in the words: for which purpose observe that excellent Rule of holy *Augustine*, (*g*) "It is as manifest an "Errour in the explication of Scripture to take figurative words properly, as to wrest those words which are properly spoken, into a Tropical or figurative sence: By both which wayes of perverting the holy Scriptures, multitudes of Heresies have troubled the Church of God. And this Doctrine of Transubstatiation, with all the mischiefs in Doctrine, Worship and Practice, which attend it, proceed from the Papists interpreting these words, *This is my body*, in a literal and proper sence, which must be understood in a *figurative* sence: The hinge of the present controversie is turned upon these two words, *this is*; now I shall make it appear, that by the word *this* is meant this Bread, and that by the word *is*, must be meant, is a Sign, or doth signifie, and so that the true sence of our Saviour in the words is this, *viz. This bread is a sign of my body, or this bread doth signifie or represent my body.*

(*g*) *August.* de Doctrina Christiana lib. 3.

That by the word *this*, is meant this bread, appears by three Reasons.

1. By the Order and Course of the words, by which it is plain, that of that bread, which Jesus took, and blessed, and brake, and commanded his Disciples to eat, he said, This is my body.

2. Because Jesus Christ saith expressely of the Cup which he took, and blessed, and gave and commanded them to Drink. *This Cup* is the New Testament. So say *Luke* and *Paul* in the Text; therefore we must conclude, that of the bread, which he took, and blessed, and brake, and gave, *&c.* he saith in effect, This bread is my body.

3. St. *Pauls* Interpretation of the words may fully convince all, that the word *this* doth demonstrate the Bread, 1 *Cor.* 10. 16. *The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?* which speak the same thing though in other words, as this bread is the

body

body of Chriſt, this Cup is the blood of Chriſt; ſo that it is clear, that by the word *this*, is meant this bread.

Secondly, Hence it follows, that the word *is*, cannot be taken properly, but muſt mean, is a *ſign*, or doth ſignifie or repreſent; it cannot be taken properly, for bread and the body of Chriſt are two Subſtances eſſentially different, and therefore it cannot be properly ſaid, that bread is eſſentially Chriſts body. (*a*) But this is a ſure Rule, that when the word *is* ſtands between the ſign and the thing ſignified, then it muſt mean is a ſign, or ſignifieth, or repreſenteth. And this is the preſent caſe, the bleſſed bread is a ſign of Chriſts Body, and therefore the meaning of Chriſt muſt be, This bread ſignifieth or repreſenteth my Body, according to that known ſaying of *Auguſtine*: (*b*) *Chriſt doubted not to ſay, This is my body, when he gave the ſign of his body.*

a Diſparatum de diſparato non proprie prædicatur.

b *Auguſt. contra Adamant. Manich. lib.* 12. Non dubitant dicere, Hoc eſt corpus meum, cum ſignum daret corporis ſui.

Obſerve yet further, That whereas there is no Example in all the Scripture, of a Sign being turned into the thing ſignified, yet it is very ordinary in Scripture-ſimilitudes, to give a thing the Name of that whereunto it is likened; *I am the Roſe of Sharon, and the Lilly of the Valleys, Cant.* 2. *I am the living bread, Joh.* 6. *I am the door, Joh.* 10. *I am the true Vine, Joh.* 15. All theſe ſaith Chriſt of himſelf, but is he therefore turned into a Roſe or Lilly, or Bread, or Door, or Vine; no, the words taken literally and properly, are blaſphemy; but the meaning is, he is like theſe, as to the particular caſes whereof he ſpeaks.

So the Scripture ordinarily gives to Signs the Names of the things ſignified, *Geneſ.* 40. 12. *The three branches are three dayes, v.* 18. *The three baskets are three dayes*; and of ſuch things we have a multitude of Examples. And thus the Holy Ghoſt gives to Sacramental ſigns, the names of the things ſignified by them. Circumciſion is cal'd the Covenant, whereof it was a Sign and Seal, *Gen.* 17. 13. the Lamb is cal'd the Paſſeover, *Exod.* 12. 11. and ſo in the Text the bread is cal'd Chriſts body, and the wine his blood, becauſe they are Signs, and a Seal to ſignifie and convey Chriſt, with the benefits of his body broken, and of his blood ſhed for us. And thus I have proved, that this Scripture is not for, but againſt Tranſubſtantiation, in all the branches of it.

The other Scripture which they alleadge for Tranſubſtantiation, is our Saviours diſcourſe *of eating his fleſh, and drinking his blood*, in *Joh.* 6. And *Bellarmine* (*c*) pretends to prove that Doctrine from *v.* 51. of that chapter, almoſt to the end of the Chapter.

c *Bellarm. de Euchar. lib.* 1. *cap.* 5, 6.

To this I ſay, that I do readily grant, that the fleſh and blood of Chriſt here ſpoken of, which include the benefits of his death, is the ſpiritual matter of the Feaſt of the Lords Supper; and that Believers are here required to feaſt their Souls by Faith on the body and blood of Chriſt, and on all the benefits of his death, in all thoſe wayes which God is pleaſed to offer it to them: And therefore though the Lords Supper be ſince inſtituted, yet they are bound by this Scripture to feed on the body and blood of Chriſt in that Ordinance, in the appointed uſe of bread and wine.

wine. But yet this Scripture alſo is fully againſt Tranſubſtantiation, and the corporal preſence of the body and blood of Chriſt, under the Accidents of Bread and Wine, and the Communicants eating and drinking the ſame; and this appears by theſe three Reaſons.

I. Becauſe as I have proved, our Saviour tels us, that his fleſh, *viz.* the corporal eating his fleſh profiteth nothing *ver.* 63.

II. Becauſe the eating the fleſh and drinking the blood of Chriſt here ſpoken of, is of abſolute neceſſity to ſalvation, *v.* 53. *Except ye eat the fleſh of the ſon of man, and drink his blood ye have no life in you*, but though none can be happy who do not eat the fleſh and drink the blood of Chriſt in the ſence of this Scripture, yet our adverſaries do not deny, but many have eternal life who never eat and drank the Lords Supper.

III. Becauſe Eternal life is certainly ſetled and entail'd on all thoſe who do eat the fleſh and drink the blood of Chriſt in the ſence of this Scripture, *ver.* 54. *Whoſo eateth my fleſh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, and I will raiſe him up at the laſt day*; and yet the Papiſts tell us that wicked men may corporally eat the fleſh and drink the blood of Chriſt; ſo that the Popiſh eating the fleſh and drinking the blood of Chriſt, and that eating his fleſh and drinking his blood, which our Saviour here ſpeaks of, are as farre different as heaven and hell.

2. *Argument.* It is impoſſible that this Tranſubſtantiation ſhould be in the Lords Supper, this is evident by the nature of the thing: for who ſo underſtands the nature of this act of Tranſubſtantiation, and the terms thereof, *viz.* the bread and wine, which are the things that are turned, and the body and blood of Chriſt into which this bread and wine are turned, muſt clearly ſee that as hereby the bread and wine muſt be taken away, ſo the body and blood of Chriſt muſt be hereby made and produc'd: and therefore in their *Letany* of the Sacrament they doe invocate it thus; *panis omnipotentiâ Dei caro factus miſerere nobis*: O Bread which by the Almighty power of God art made fleſh have mercy upon us, implying that the fleſh and body of Chriſt is made by this Tranſubſtantiation, and thus by this blaſphemous contradiction they make the ſubſtance of the glorious body of Chriſt, ſo long ſince born of the Virgin, to be the birth of this prodigious monſter of Tranſubſtantiation; now I ſay it is impoſſible to make that which was made before, to do that by an act which was done before the act, its impoſſible for the effect to be before the cauſe, and its impoſſible for bread of a few hours old to be turn'd into the ſubſtance of the body of Chriſt, which was continually of the ſame ſubſtance for above a 1000 years before.

And therefore though theſe blaſphemers ſeem devoutly to adore the Almighty power of God, which by this converſion hath wrought *ſtupendum ſupra omnia miraculum*, the moſt ſtupendious of all miracles, as they invocate it in the ſame Lettany of the Sacrament; yet all in effect that they can ſay is this, that the great God out of his infinite love to his Church hath in this bleſſed ordinance of the Lords Supper by many aſtoniſhing miracles done juſt nothing, and thus they moſt pro-

phanely

phanely abuse the fearfull name of God in ascribing a work to his dreadfull omnipotency, which is beneath the power of his meanest creature, *viz.* to make that which was made before, which indeed cannot be a work of any power at all. I know some learned men of the Church of *Rome* do undertake to decline this impossibility and contradiction, and yet to defend this doctrine of Transubstantiation as defin'd in the Council of Trent, and therefore *Bellarmine* with many of his brethren the Jesuites to avoid the aforesaid impossibility; explaines this action of Transubstantiation thus, that the conversion of the bread into the body of Christ, *non esse productivam sed adductivam*, that it is not such a conversion that produceth the body of Christ, for that was extant before, but it is such a conversion, whereby the body of Christ which was before in heaven, is now (yet without any local motion from heaven) made present under the accidents of bread in the Lords Supper. But whilst their champion by another contradiction (in making the same body of Christ, which is in heaven to be under the accidents of bread on earth, and yet without receiving any new being or moving from heaven to earth) pleads for Transubstantiation, he destroyes both the *name*, and *nature* of it: He destroys *the name* of it, for that conversion, which he speaks of, may be cal'd *a Desubstantiation or destruction* of the bread, and *a translocation, or transposition* of the body of Christ, whereby it is placed where it was not before, but can by no means bear the name of *Transubstantiation*, which (saith the Council of Trent) the Catholick Church doth very fitly and properly give it.

a *Bellarm.* de Euchar. lib. 3. cap. 18.

Again he destroyes the nature of Transubstantiation, for in every substantial conversion, whereby one substance is turned into another, the latter is alwaies produc'd, and receives being upon the destruction of the former, as when *Moses* his rod was turned into a serpent, *Exod.*4. had God only destroy'd the substance of the rod, and set a Serpent, that was extant before in the place of it, this had not been a turning the rod into a Serpent. So when at the marriage-feast, *John* 2. Christ turn'd water into wine, had God only destroyed the substance of the water, and set wine that was extant before in some wine-sellar, and plac'd it in the water-pots, this had not been a turning water into wine; but the true substance of the serpent, and the true substance of the wine were by those miraculous conversions made and produc'd, and so if the true substance *of the bread and wine* be miraculously turn'd into the substance *of the body and blood of Christ*, as the Council of *Trent* will have it, upon the destruction of the substance of the bread and wine, there must necessarily be produc'd the substance of the body and blood of Christ, as the effect and product of that conversion: and notwithstanding all the noise which our adversaries make in the Christian world, about this matter, they must either assert this monstrous impossibility, and contradiction, or disclaim their own doctrine of Transubstantiation.

3 *Argument.* This doctrine of Transubstantiation destroyes the Lords Supper, my reason is, because this doctrine takes away those sacred signs of

of bread and wine, which God hath appointed to be of absolute necessity to the being of this Sacrament, and if these be taken away there is no such thing as the Lords Supper in the world.

Our Adversaries grant, that its necessary to the being of a Sacrament, that there be a sensible, and sacred sign, and that must signifie a sacred and holy thing, and this sign must be of Gods institution.(*a*)

a *Thom. par. 3. qu. 60. art. 1. 2. 5.*

Now the sign or signs in this Sacrament of the Lords Supper, must be one of these three things.

1. It must be either the body and blood of Christ.
2. Or it must be the accidents of bread and wine.
3. Or it must be true bread and wine.

I. It cannot be the body and blood of Christ, for these are not sensible, and they are the things signified, and therefore they cannot be the signs.

II. It cannot be the Accidents of bread and wine, though *Bellarmin*, as I have shewed, makes these to signifie the body and blood of Christ, and so to be essential to this Sacrament; but this cannot be, for two Reasons.

1. Because, as I have proved, the accidents without the substance are nothing, and so can signifie nothing, and therefore can be no signes.

2. Every Sacramental sign must be (as our adversaries confess) of Gods institution, now God never ordained the accidents *of bread and wine* without the substance to signifie the body and blood of Christ; if he did, either they must be consecrated to this use by virtue of these words, *this is my body, this cup is my blood, &c.* or these words must declare them to be of this use, but our adversaries dare not stand to either of these, for then they must yield, that the meaning of these words is, these accidents of bread and wine are signes of, or do signifie the body and blood of Christ, but that by the word *this* is meant these accidents, *Bellarmin* as I have shewed, denies, and that the word *is*, doth denote is a sign or doth signifie, they will by no means admit, because it doth justifie our sence of that word, as speaking of the bread and wine, and overthrowes all their Disputations to prove that the word *is*, must not be taken in a figurative but proper sence, and indeed overthrowes their whole Doctrine of Transubstantiation. So that it's manifest, that neither Christ's body and blood, nor the Accidents of bread and wine can be the Signs in this Sacrament.

3. It remains therefore, that the true bread and wine, must be the only sacred and appointed Signs of the body and blood of Christ in the Lords Supper; and that therefore the Papists in destroying the bread and wine, do utterly destroy this blessed Sacrament, and tear off this sacred Seal from the Covenant of Grace, and rob the Church of God, of the body and blood of Christ, and of all the benefits of his Death, as signified and conveyed to them by this Ordinance.

4 *Argument.* Those Miracles which the Papists affirm to be wrought

by Tranſubſtantiation in the Lords Supper, are all falſe and feigned. In purſuance of this Argument, I ſhall

First, Repeat ſome of thoſe Miracles which are ſaid to be wrought by this Act of Tranſubſtantiation.

Secondly, Prove them to be falſe and feigned.

(1.) I ſhall only repeat Four of their pretended Miracles.

1. That the Subſtance of the bread and wine is turned into the body and blood of Chriſt, and yet his body and blood were extant above a thouſand years before the bread and wine were in being.

2. That the Subſtance of the bread and wine is deſtroyed, and the Accidents made to remain without the ſubſtance, and yet no ſenſible difference made between the natural Properties of this bleſſed bread and wine, and all other bread and wine in the world, wherein the Subſtance continues with the Accidents.

3. That at the firſt Adminiſtration of this Sacrament, the Body of Chriſt ſhould be in all its compleat parts, head, arms, limbs, and all his fleſh and bones at the Table, and there ſeen and to be felt, and yet the ſame body, at the ſame time in the mouths and ſtomachs of his Diſciples, and they not have the leaſt ſence of it.

4. That the ſame body of Chriſt ſhould be glorified in Heaven, and at the ſame time, be in the mouths and ſtomachs of all the Communicants in the world, and be with thoſe Accidents of bread, whereſoever they are, and no where elſe, and yet not move from Heaven to Earth, nor from one place of the Earth to another, and ſtill be one and the ſame body.

(2.) I ſay, theſe and all ſuch are feigned and falſe Miracles, as appears by theſe ſix Reaſons.

1. Becauſe, Though they are pretended to be the ſtupendious and miraculous works of the Almighty power of God, yet are they no Miracles at all, but impoſſibilities and contradictions, as I have proved, and ſo are nothing, and are not works of ſo much power as for a Worm to creep, and a Graſhopper to leap.

2. Becauſe, No Miracles were ever wrought upon ſenſible Creatures, but the change made by them was diſcerned, or at leaſt diſcernible by the ſenſes of men, for whoſe ſake they were wrought: The Serpent which *Moſes* his Rod was turn'd into, the Wine which the Water was turn'd into, and all the Miracles wrought by *Moſes* in *Egypt*, with all other ſuch Miracles recorded in Scripture, not one excepted, were perceived by the ſenſes; and ſo if one ſenſible Creature be turn'd into another ſenſible Creature, that which the former is turn'd into muſt be made ſenſible, or if a ſenſible Creature be turn'd into an inſenſible, that which is ſo turned muſt paſs out of the reach of the ſenſes, and become inſenſible. And therefore there is no ſuch Miracle wrought as is here pretended, becauſe here is ſenſible bread and wine, and the ſenſes of men

do

do see, and handle, and taste as plain bread and wine, as there is any in the world.

3. Because God never settled such a Power on any order of men, for every one in that Order, to have in all Ages a constant power to work Miracles, and yet by this Doctrine of Transubstantiation, every Priest doth carry about him a power to work more and greater Miracles than ever were wrought by Christ and his Apostles.

4. Because God never set up any stated Ordinance in the Church for the working of Miracles, nor bound himself upon any mens using any Scripture words, alwayes to work Miracles; and yet the Papists will have God alwayes bound to work Miracles, upon every Priests rightly pronouncing in the Lords Supper these words, *This is my body.*

5. God never gave men a power to work Miracles on the glorified body of Christ: *Moses* had power *to divide the waters of the Red Sea*, *Exod.* 14. 21. and *Joshua* had once power to say to the Sun and Moon, *Sun stand thou still upon mount Gibeon, and thou Moon in the valley of Ajelon*, *Josh.* 10. 12. and the Disciples had power *to cast out Devils*, *Matth.* 10. 8. and Christ tells his Disciples, *Math.* 17. 20. *If ye have Faith as a grain of Mustard-seed, ye shall say unto this mountain, Remove hence into yonder place, and it shall remove:* but for every dirty Priest to practise such a miraculous power upon the glorified body of Christ, as upon the using of these words, *This is my body*, to call it to be locally and corporally present in all the mouths and stomachs of all the Communicants at the Lords Supper; is such a Popish Dream, as exceeds all the fanatick Enthusiasmes in the world, but can never be reckoned in the number of any true Divine Miracles.

6. All these pretended Miracles are of no use, and to no purpose, as to the ends of this Ordinance; but without them we have the body and blood of Christ, with all the benefits of his Death represented, and communicated to us, and so do attain all the ends of this Sacrament in the appointed use of this blessed bread and wine.

5 *Argument.* The Doctrine of Transubstantiation is false, because all the senses of all men in the world do testifie, that bread and wine remain in the Lords Supper after Consecration, and this testimony is true: That all the senses of all men in the world, who are in their senses, and know what bread and wine are, and have them so placed that the senses may perceive them, do testifie that this is bread and wine, is not denyed; but that which is denyed, and I am to prove, is, that this Testimony of the Senses is true, and that I prove by these four Reasons.

1. Because by this testimony a man hath the same evidence, that bread and wine remain in the Lords Supper after consecration, as he hath that there are any visible or sensible Creatures in the world; for if when a man sees, and toucheth, and tasts, and smells bread and wine, and hears the wine poured out, he cannot truely know, and upon his knowledge by his senses, truely say, that what he so sees, and tastes, and toucheth,

and smells, and hears, is bread and wine; he cannot upon his knowledge by his senses truely say, that there is a Sun, or Moon, or Starres, or Men, or Birds, or Beasts, or Trees, or Stones, or Earth, or Water, or any bread and wine in the world; for the senses cannot give him a more full and sure evidence of the being of any of these Creatures, than they do of the being of bread and wine in the Lords Supper.

2. Because, if the testimony of the senses be not true, then all that Religion which is founded on Gods manifesting himself by the Creatures, to the Understandings of men, in the use of their Senses, is not a true Religion, but is quite extinguished out of the world, and so there is no Law of Nature binding men truely to know, and love, and prayse God, as he is manifested in the Creatures; and then it is no sin at all for men to take no notice of the glory of God, which the Heavens, and Earth, and Day, and Night, declare to them, *Psal.* 19. And then the Apostles words are not true, in telling us, *That the eternal Power and Godhead are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made*, *Rom.* 1.20. For if by the use of our senses we cannot know, that these things are true, then we neither can, nor are bound to know and honour, and love the Wisdom, and Power, and Goodness of God in them.

3. If the testimony of the Senses be not true, we have no certainty of the Christian Religion; for we cannot know there is a Bible, or letters, or words in it; or that there is a Church, or any such Society of Believers, or that there are Ministers, or Sermons, or Sacraments in the world, for all these are perceived by our senses.

4. If our Saviours Argument was good, to prove that by his *flesh* and *bones*, perceived by the senses, he was no Spirit, *Luk.* 24. 39. *Behold my hands and my feet, handle me and see.* Then this Argument is also good, behold, handle, taste and smell, and thereby judge if there be not a sensible Substance, and this particular Substance of bread and wine in the Lords Supper.

There are two main Objections which the Papists make against this Argument, which I shall answer, and so proceed.

1 *Object.* Senses do not indeed erre in their testimony of their own Objects; but Accidents only, and not Substances, are the Objects of the Senses, and therefore the testimony of the senses concerning Substances is not to be trusted.

Answ. If so, then we can judge of no Substance in the world by our senses, and we cannot know but we are only in a world of Accidents, *viz.* of Colours, and Smells and Sounds, *&c.* and our understandings cannot perceive by them, that there are any Substances in the world, much less discern betwixt one substance and another, but every man by the use of his senses perceives sensible substances by means of the accidents inherent in them, or else no man can swear in judgement any thing concerning any Man, or Beast, or House, or Lands, or Goods, neither can there be any civil converse among men in the world.

2 *Object.*

2 *Object.* Senſe muſt yield to be corrected and over-ruled by Faith, and Gods Word muſt be believed before our Senſes.

Anſw. 1. This is but a Popiſh trick, to hide the truth of God; for it is not our preſent queſtion, whether we muſt believe God or our Senſes, but whether we muſt believe the words of a company of cheating Papiſts, or believe God ſpeaking to our underſtandings by Scripture, by Reaſon, by the Creatures, and by our Senſes, and by all thoſe things which are witneſſes of his Truth to our Souls.

2. We do in this matter give Faith its due place in our Hearts; for our Underſtandings do here perceive by that uſe of our Senſes, which God hath made them for, that here is Bread and Wine; but that this Bread and Wine are bleſſed to ſignifie, and convey to us the Body and Blood of Chriſt, this we aſſent unto by Faith; and by Faith we *do diſcern the Lords body, and blood*, in the uſe of that Bread and Wine which we diſcern by our Senſes: And thus we own both the Truths of God, *viz.* That there is Bread and Wine in the Lords Supper, and that Chriſt crucified is therein preſented to our Souls in the uſe of them, and ſo we give both Faith and Senſe their due place and uſe in us.

3. We believe, that the Truths revealed to our underſtandings by the viſible Creatures, in the uſe of our Senſes, are as the Apoſtle ſpeaks, *the Truths of God*, *Rom.* 1. 25. And that it is a Truth of God, that the Creatures we ſpeak of, are Bread and Wine, becauſe we underſtand by our ſenſes, that they have the nature, and all the Properties of Bread and Wine, and we know that *the God that cannot lie*, cannot ſpeak a Truth to our underſtandings, by the Creatures, and by our Senſes, and then deny and contradict it by his Word to our Faith.

It may now be expected, that I ſhould here give you an account of the Doctrine of the Ancients in this matter, but to this I ſhall only ſay theſe three things.

1. That this is undertaken, and I doubt not, is effectually performed by a Reverend Brother, whoſe work aſſigned him is to prove the *Novelty of Popery*, both in this their great Article of Tranſubſtantiation, and alſo in other Popiſh Doctrines, to whoſe Diſcourſe I referre you for ſatisfaction herein.

2. That I do profeſs to honour the ancient Fathers in the Church of God, who have in their ſeveral Ages been faithfull witneſſes to this, and other Truths of God reveal'd in the Scriptures; and I do rejoyce in my hopes of being in the ſame bleſſed Body of Chriſt with them: but I have choſen to inſiſt on theſe Arguments, which I hope to defend, knowing that all that the Scripture, Reaſon, and Senſes do ſpeak, God ſpeaketh by them; but I cannot ſay of all that *Juſtin Martyr*, *Tertullian*, *Cyprian*, *Ambroſe*, *Auſtin*, *Hierom*, &c. do ſpeak, that God ſpeaketh by them; and if it had hapned, that any of theſe men had contradicted Scripture, Reaſon and Senſe (could their Opinions have been as old as the Devil in Hell) I would ſay with the Apoſtle, *Gal.* 2. 6. *Whatever they were,*

it

it maketh no matter to me, God accepteth no mans Person, for God and his Truth must not be tryed by the Judgements of fallible men.

3. That the same Doctrine which I have delivered, had its beginning from Christ, and hath passed from him by the Scriptures, through all true Antiquity, is fully proved by Bishop *Jewel*, Bishop *Morton*, *Crakenthorp*, *Molin*, and *Albertinus*, and many others, who have said more in this case than I have either time or ability to speak, or than would be fit for this Discourse; and it is as manifest that the Judgement of the ancient Fathers is against Transubstantiation, as it is that there were such persons, and that their writings are extant in the world; insomuch, that had they lived under Popish persecutions, they would have burnt those very men on Earth, and cursed them to Hell, whom they canonize for Saints, and vainly and impiously crave their Intercession in Heaven.

I shall yet answer two Objections, and then conclude with a brief Application.

1 *Object.* The Pope and his Council have determined that Transubstantiation is in the Lords Supper, and we *must* believe them.

a *Chemnitius exam. Concil. Trident.*

Answ. Chemnitius (*a*) hath told them, that it is the Confession of *Scotus*, *Cameracensis* and others, that neither Scripture, nor the Opinion of the Ancients, compell us to believe the Doctrine of Transubstantiation; and *Bellarmine* (*b*) confesseth, that what *Scotus* saith, is not improbable, *viz. That there is no express place of Scripture compells us to admit Transubstantiation without the declaration of the Church.* And so after all their Disputations and Curses, and blood-shed, and deluding so many Souls; we must believe this Doctrine of Transubstantiation, because the Pope and his Council have said it. But how shall we be infallibly assur'd, that God doth transmit his mind and will to us by the Pope and his Council? or where doth God command us to go to this infallible Oracle the Bishop of *Rome*, either singly, or conjunctly with his Council, to be concluded by him or them, in matters of Faith? But alas! what a dreadfull case is this, that a whole world of precious Souls must have no better a Foundation for their Religion and Salvation than this, *viz.* That we must all believe the Papists, and that we must believe them for this Reason, because they tell us we *must* believe them; but if they will damn their Souls in believing one another, let us labour to save ours by believing the God of Truth, speaking to us by his Word.

b *Bellarm. de Euchar. lib. 3. cap. 23.*

2 *Object.* These words, *This is my Body*, &c. are the words of our dying Lord, and to his Disciples, to whom he would not speak darkly in Figures; and they are the words of a Testament, and of a Law; and expressed in intire Propositions, all which require Plainness, and to be spoken properly, and not in dark figures: Do not these seem plausible Objections, and cunningly devis'd to trepan poor Souls into Errour? Why these are *Bellarmines* Objections. (*c*)

c *Bellarm. de Euchar. lib. 1. cap. 9.*

Answ. 1. They themselves are forced to confess, that the words, *This cup*

cup is my blood, &c. which are the words of our dying Lord, and to his Disciples, and words of a Testament, and of a Law, and an entire Proposition; are yet spoken in a figurative sence, which overthrowes all their pretended Reasons for a proper or literal sence of the words.

2. Words are not therefore dark, becaufe they are figurative, for figures often do explain, and not darken the sence of words; I confess a Trope, a Figure, a Metonymy, a Synechdoche, *&c.* are hard words to vulgar ears, but you must know that these are words of Art, which Learned men have wisely invented, but they are grounded on the natural way of mens expressing themselves, in their ordinary and familiar language: and therefore even Children, and unlearned men that cannot read, do ordinarily speak, and understand the Language that is spoken in Tropes and Figures, though they know not what Trope or Figure to reduce such expressions unto; for Example, If a man say, drink off this Cup or Glass; or as he looks on the Signs in the Streets, saith, This is a Swan, and this is a Lyon; or saith of Pictures in a Chamber, This is *Alexander*, or *Cæsar*; or saith of a written Parchment wherein he hath signified his Will, in bequeathing his Estate, This is my Will; all this is plain and easie, and familiar language, and yet few understand the Tropes in these Expressions: And so the words, *This is my body*, *this cup is my blood*, are plain and intelligible words, though few understand the Names of those Tropes or figures, which they are spoken in.

3. Whereas the Papists pretend to give a proper or literal sence of these words, yet their sence to justifie their Transubstantiation is so full of monstrous and blasphemous contradictions, and so dark, that neither they themselves, nor others understand them: Sometimes the word *this* must signifie *these accidents*; sometimes *this substance* contained under these Accidents: But this substance must neither be the Bread nor Christs Body, but an *individuum vagum*, and though the word *this* applyed to a substance doth alwayes determine and demonstrate the said substance, yet here they make it to signifie such a vagrant, that all the world knowes not where to finde it. And in like manner they rack the word *is*, which must sometimes mean *is* properly and essentially, when it speaks of the Accidents, sometimes *is made*, sometimes *is transubstantiated*, and one (*a*) will have it to denote all these: And thus they torture this plain Scripture, to serve their odious Doctrine of Transubstantiation; and when they have done all, they have nothing but the word of a blasphemous Pope, and factious Council for it.

(*a*) *Cornelius a Lapide, in* 1 Cor. 11.

Uses. Six Inferences.

1 *Inf.* That it is Idolatry in the Papists to worship the consecrated Bread, though they think it is turned into the Body of Christ.

I should here speak to two things.

1. That their worshipping the consecrated Bread, is Idolatry.

2. That

2. That their *thinking* it to be the Body of Christ, doth not excuse them from Idolatry.

(1.) For the first, I shall briefly speak to three things.

1. Acquaint you with their *Doctrine* herein.
2. Acquaint you with their *Practice*.
3. Prove that their practising this Doctrine is *Idolatry*.

1. Their Doctrine is declared in the Council of *Trent* thus. (*a*) That it is an undoubted Truth, that all Christians ought to give the same Worship to the Sacrament of the Eucharist, which they give to God himself, and that if any deny this, let him be accursed.

a *Concil. Trident. Sess.* 13. *cap.* 5. Nullus itaque dubitandi locus relinquitur, cùm omnes Christi fideles, pro more in Catholicâ Ecclesiâ semper recepto, latriæ cultum, qui vero Deo debetur, hunc sanctissimo Sacramento in veneratione adhibeant-----

Can. 6. Si quis dixerit in sancto Eucharistiæ Sacramento Christum unigenitum Dei filium, non esse cultu latriæ etiam externo adorandum, venerandum: neque in processionibus, secundum laudabilem, & universalem Ecclesiæ sanctæ ritum, & consuetudinem, & solenniter circumgestandum, vel non publicè ut adoretur populo proponendum, & ejus adoratores esse Idolatras, *Anathema* sit.

2. They practise this Doctrine, for in their *Roman* Missal, the Priests are taught to lift up the Host, and to worship it themselves, thrice striking their breasts, and saying, *O Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the World, have mercy upon us.* And among many instances that may be given of their Idolatrous practice herein, I shall only give you this: "In the year 1666. at *Lyons* in *France*, it was instituted, that a company of devout persons taking "their turns, should perpetually day and night adore "the holy Sacrament, some of them alwayes kneeling before it in a certain Church chosen by them: And in a large place more spacious than "*Lincolns-Inne Fields*, *London*, cal'd *Belle Cour*, the Sacrament was "exposed on a rich and magnifick Altar, (set on a high Scaffold) to be "adored by all the Town together; and there were about threescore "thousand people on their knees together, worshipping it; the most glorious Triumph that ever was seen, (saith a *Jesuite* in his late description "of this City.) And thus do these poor deluded wretches solemnly give that Worship to Wafers which is only due to God himself.

3. That this practice is Idolatry, appears,

First, By all that I have said against Transubstantiation; for seeing the substance of the Bread remains, as I have prov'd, the Papist's worshipping this Bread, must needs be gross Idolatry: For the Council of *Trent* makes Transubstantiation to be the ground and reason of this solemn Adoration. (*b*) And its a known saying of their own *Costerus* to this purpose, That if by Transubstantiation the Bread be not turned into the Body of Christ, their worshipping the Host is the greatest Idolatry in the world.

b *Sess.* 1. *cap.* 4, 5.

Secondly, It is gross Idolatry to give that Worship to a Creature which is only due to God; and yet these men fall down unto, and worship, and call upon this Bread; as all Believers fall down unto, and worship and call upon God: Their practice herein is much like their Idolatry in worshipping their graven Images, mentioned *Isa.* 44. 16. 17. *He burneth part thereof in the fire, with part thereof he eateth flesh; he roasteth*

roſteth the reſt, and is ſatisfied, yea he warmeth himſelf, and ſaith, Aha, I am warm, I have ſeen the fire, and the reſidue thereof he maketh a God, even his graven Image, he falleth down unto it, and worſhippeth it, and prayeth unto it, and ſaith, Deliver me, for thou art my God; in like manner do the Idolatrous Papiſts by this Bread, part thereof they take into their mouths, and grind with their teeth, and eat it, and part of it (as in the caſe of the Rats and Worms eating the conſecrated Bread,) they caſt into the fire and burn it, and part thereof they reſerve for their God, and carry it about, and fall down to it, and worſhip it, and pray to it, as to their Saviour, to ſave them from their ſins.

(2.) I proceed to prove, that the Papiſts thinking this Bread to be the Body of Chriſt, doth not excuſe them from Idolatry: This is evident, for God's Law being ſufficiently reveal'd, mans wilful ignorance thereof cannot extinguiſh the Obligation of it, nor alter the nature of that ſin which is a breach of that Law; the Heathens worſhipping the Sun is Idolatry, though they think it to be God; ſo the Papiſts worſhipping the Wafer is Idolatry, though they think it to be the Body of Chriſt with his Soul and God-head; as to kill the Saints of God, is murder and perſecution, though the enemies may think they do therein God ſervice, *Joh.* 16. 2.

2 *Inference.* Hence ſee under what Characters we are to look upon the Papiſts: We are told what Names ſome of their Flatterers have given to ſome of their Popes. In the Council of *Lateran*, it's ſaid of the Pope: *All Power in Heaven and Earth is given to thee*; and *Panormitan* ſaith, *the Pope can do all things that God can do.* The Ambaſſadours of *Sicily* cry'd to one Pope, *Thou that takeſt away the ſins of the World, have mercy upon us*; and ſaith a Biſhop in a prophane quibble of Pope *Leo*, *Behold the Lyon of the Tribe of Judah, we have waited for thee* (*O moſt bleſſed* Leo) *to be our Saviour.* See *Brightman* on *Revel.* 13. 3. and we know his *Holineſs* is the Name given him by the Papiſts; and the *Romiſh* Church doth arrogate the Name of the only Holy Catholick Church. But if we will give the Papiſts a Name from their Religion and Practice, we muſt give them three characters.

Firſt, They are an *Idolatrous* People, as appears by what I have now ſaid, and as is made known to you by more Arguments from other hands; and therefore we need not envy their Grandeur, and Kingdom upon Earth, ſeeing the Apoſtle aſſures us, 1 *Cor.* 6. 9, 10. That no *Idolaters have any Inheritance in the Kingdom of God.*

Secondly, They are a moſt *uncharitable* and cruel people; and though their School-men do ingeniouſly plead, that Charity or Love is the moſt excellent of all Graces, and meaſure the worth of other Graces, and the evil of all ſins by Charity; yet are they a moſt inhumane and barbarous People: and this is not only evident, by all the blood of the Saints, that lies crying at their doors for vengeance, but alſo that they will have all men curſed and damned, who will not in defiance of God, and Scripture,

and Reason, and Sense, say that Bread is no Bread, and who will not believe that the God of Truth doth speak all the hideous contradictions in their Doctrine of Transubstantiation; as if having usurp'd the keyes of Hell and Death, they had decreed that all Believers shall be damned, and that none but Atheists and Infidels shall be saved.

Thirdly, A *perjured* people, in that they impose, and many of them take this Oath. "I *N. N.* do swear, that this conversion, which 'the Catholick Church doth call Transubstantiation, is made in the Eu-"charist, without the Belief of which no man can be saved. What horrid Perjury is this, to swear that Bread is no Bread, and Wine is no Wine, and that all the contradictions in the Doctrine of Transubstantiation are true, and that all are damned who do not believe the same.

3 *Inference.* Hence we see, that there is no Communion to be had with the Church of *Rome*; for except we will all renounce our present Christianity, and profess that we are no Members of the Church of God, till we are in union with the Pope, and so proclaim our selves, and all Christians in the world, who are not Papists, to be a generation of dissembling Knaves, and except we first turn Atheists, and believe that God speaks lies and contradictions we cannot turn Papists.

4 *Inference.* Hence see what a dreadfull slavery it is to be the servants and slaves to the Devil, who engageth his servants to debauch their Consciences, and rack their wits, and to spend their precious time, and parts, and Learning, to spread and defend Nonsence and Lies. *Bellarmine (b)* saith, he spent fifteen years about Controversies in Religion: A fearfull thing, that a man of so great Learning and parts should waste a great part of his Age, and much of it in contradicting God, and the Truth, and himself; but though I will not judge any one that is gone into the Eternal World, yet I would warn all to take heed especially how they venture to sin in print, lest their Books should be speaking for the Devil on Earth, when they themselves are tormented with the Devil in Hell.

b *Epist. Sexto* 5.

5 *Inference.* Be faithfull to the Truths of God, and let them not be held in unrighteousness in your judgements, but let them rule in your Hearts and Lives; if Truth prevail to make you holy, then though Seducers may make Merchandize of your Estates, yet they shall never make Merchandize of your Souls; but if you will not love the Truth, and walk in the Truth, all our Arguments cannot secure you from the Temptations of the Devil and Seducers, nor keep God from being angry with you, and from giving you up to strong delusions to believe lies.

Ult. Bless God for your Religion, that your Religion comes from the Grace of God by his Word, to make you holy here, and happy hereafter, and not from the Devil and Pope, to feed your Lusts, and damn your Souls, and to make you goe ignorantly and quietly to Hell; and

and bleſs God that you have in this Nation the true Doctrine of the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, which as I ſaid in the beginning of this Diſcourſe, ſo I ſay again in the Concluſion, is clearly and fully delivered from the mind of Chriſt in theſe words, and which hath been ſealed by the blood of thoſe bleſſed Martyrs in our own Land, who have been ſacrificed to death for the ſervice of your Faith, whoſe Blood was of more value than all the Popes that ever uſurped Supremacy over the Church and Body of Chriſt.

SERMON XXII.

The Right of every Believer to the bleſſed *Cup* in the *Lords Supper*.

Mr Richard Steel

Matth. XXVI. 27, 28.

And he took the Cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, ſaying, Drink ye all of it. For this is my Blood of the New Teſtament, which is ſhed for many, for the Remiſſion of ſins.

THE declared *Will* of God being the moſt certain and happy *Rule* of mans practice, eſpecially in thoſe Duties which have no Foundation ſave in *Divine Revelation*; it is the greateſt Arrogance and Affront to the *Wiſdom* and *Will* of our Law-giver to contradict him therein: But when our *bleſſed Redeemer* hath in his Inſtitutions plainly conſulted our *Benefit* and *Comfort*, when he hath ſtooped ſo low, to raiſe us up ſo high; to croſs and correct him therein, is the ſtrangeſt *folly* and *ingratitude* that is imaginable.

Yet hereof we have a ſad *Inſtance* in the preſent *Church* of *Rome* in the buſineſs of the *Lords Supper*; where nothing can be more plain than our Saviours *Inſtitution* on the one ſide, nor more palpable than their *Corruption* of it on the other: wherein is evident the lamentable *Degeneracy* of the Humane Nature, together with the power of *Prejudice*, and the miſchief of a wilfull *Obſtinacy*, eſpecially when accompanyed with the worldly Intereſt of *Profit* or *Honour*.

It hath been indeed the more ordinary humour of that *Church*, to invent and *adde* burthenſome ſuperfluities to other of Gods Ordinances, but they whoſe Conſciences will permit them to adde, will eaſily adventure alſo to *diminiſh* when it ſerves their turn; as appears in their denying to

to Gods people the *one half* of the *Lords Supper*, to wit, the *facred Cup*, againſt the ſtream of *Scripture*, and all *Antiquity*.

The vindicating of this bleſſed Ordinance of *God* is my preſent work, and I cannot have a better ground to build upon, than the words of the *holy Evangeliſt* which are before you.

Wherein you may pleaſe to conſider,

1. *The Connexion* [*And*] i. e. having immediately before *taken bread, bleſſed it, and delivered* to his Diſciples, *in like manner* he now takes the *Cup*.

2. *The Narration*, (1) Of what our *Saviour did*. The ordinary Actions of *Princes* are obſerved; with what carefull *Reverence* then ſhould we ponder this *Extraordinary Action* of the *King of Heaven*, eſpecially when he was at Death's door? *Three* things he *did*, 1. *He took the Cup*. 2. *He gave thanks*. 3. *He gave it to them*. It was the *Practice* of the *Jews*, unto which certainly *Our Saviour* had regard herein, at the end of their *Feaſts*, for the Maſter thereof to take *a Cup of Wine*, and after a ſhort *Thanksgiving* to drink a little thereof, and ſo the *Cup* paſſed round the Table, and this they termed, *a Cup of Thanksgiving*. This *Uſe* he was pleaſed to tranſlate and ſanctifie to be *a ſacred Rite* at the Lords Supper to the end of the World: As he did adopt their *waſhing* of their *Proſelytes* in the inſtitution of *Baptiſm*.

P. Fag. in Deut. 8. 10. *ex Rabbin.* כוס הלל

(2) Here is an account of what *Our Saviour ſaid*; when, if ever, his *lips were like Lillies dropping ſweet-ſmelling Myrhe*. Where there is

Cant. 5. 13.

Firſt, *A Command*, [*Drink ye all of it*] wherein you have,

1. *The thing commanded*, [*Drink of it*,] that is, (by an uſual figure) of the *Wine* contained in this Cup: or, as *ſome Tranſlations* read [*Drink out of it.*]

Dutch.

2. *The Perſons intended*, [*ye all*] that is, all ye *my Diſciples* in the firſt place; who upon occaſion of celebrating the *Paſſeover* (they being our *Saviours* ordinary Family) were then alone with him at the *Table*. But foraſmuch as he commanded them to do this in *remembrance of him*, that is, when he was *dead*, and the Apoſtle *Paul* declares, that this Sacramental Action muſt continue *untill he come*, and that by *all that are ſanctified in Chriſt Jeſus*, that are able *to examine themſelves*, therefore the [*All*] in the *Text* muſt neither be confined to the *Perſons* of the *Apoſtles*, nor to them that ſucceed them in any particular *Office*, but concludes all that are *adult Diſciples* of *Jeſus Chriſt* to the end of the world.

1 Cor 1. 2 *with* 1 Cor. 11. 28.

Secondly, *A Reaſon*, or *Argument* to urge the due participation thereof, drawn from the *Sacramental Nature of that Cup*. *For this* (to wit, the Wine contained in this Cup) *is my blood of the New Teſtament*: Or, (as the Evangeliſt *Luke*, *ch.* 22. 20. delivereth it) *This Cup is the New Teſtament in my blood*, that is, the *New Covenant ſealed with my blood*. For neither the *Cup*, nor the Wine in it, nor the *blood* of Chriſt is properly the New *Covenant* or *Teſtament*; but by this that is contained in this Cup, the

New

New Covenant which is sealed and confirmed by the Blood of Christ is kept in remembrance. He saith in effect, As Covenants used to be confirmed by the *shedding of blood*, so do I by my Blood seal to you a *New* † *Covenant*, far *better* than the Old, which demanded perfect Obedience, and denounced the Curse for defect thereof; but this promiseth *Remission* of sins; and a Covenant far *clearer*, than when it was administred under the *shadowes* of the Law, which hereby are *abrogated*. And therefore *drink ye all of this*, that have an *interest* in *that Covenant*, and that have need of *this blood*.

† So the word διαθήκη is most commonly taken: and so most properly in this place as the Epithet [*New*] which is adjoyned, evinceth.

And this *Blood* is illustrated, (1) By a necessary *Adjunct* to it, namely, this Cup doth represent my blood [*which is shed*;] which cannot be exemplified by eating the blood with the body, but as shed out of the veins; for without *shedding of blood* there was *no remission*. And this *Our Saviour* expresseth in the *present* tense [*is shed*] to assure his Disciples *then*, that it would certainly and suddenly be done, and to assure all true Believers *now* of the reality of it, though it be past, as if it were now in doing.

Heb. 9. 22.

(2) By the *Finis cui*, or the *Persons for whom* it is shed [*for many*] so this *Evangelist*, and the *next*, that doth epitomize him: To shew, 1. That he dyed not for himself, but for others; Or perhaps 2. By this restrain'd Expression to exclude *Judas*; Or rather, 3. This Blood is not only shed for you *Apostles*, but for abundance more. Which the *Evangelist Luke*, and *Paul* after him, express in other terms, and say, *my blood shed* [*for you*] that *each* of them might apply it to themselves. So that all Believers for whom this precious Blood was shed, have an undoubted Right to drink of it.

Maldonat. in loc.

(3) By the *Finis cujus*, or the *End for which* this Blood is shed, and that is expressely [*for the remission of Sins*] This *Lamb of God* came, and lived and died to *take away the sins of the World*. For though Sin was *satisfied* for by *Jesus Christ*, and so we are said to be *redeemed*; yet because no satisfaction was made *by us*, therefore we are said to be *remitted*. So then whosoever can triumph in the benefit of Remission of Sins, hath a just right to drink of this Cup, which seals the *New covenant*, and the *forgiveness of sins*.

From these words thus explain'd I lay down this *Assertion* or *Doctrine*:

Doct. *That every adult Believer hath an undenyable Right to the Blessed Cup in the Lords Supper.*

In the handling of which *Truth*, I shall briefly,

1. *State the Question.*
2. *Prove the Position.*
3. *Refute the Objections.*
4. *Make Application.*

For

I.

For the right *stating of the Question* you may observe,

1. That our business is not, to debate, *Whether a man may or may not receive Christ, and all his benefits under one Element in the Lords Supper*; for we acknowledge, that this may be done by the Spirit of God working Faith in the heart, as *with*, so *without* either of them.

2. We undertake not to prove, that *To partake of both Bread and Wine in the Lords Supper is absolutely necessary, and that to salvation.* We affirm, that the *spiritual* eating of *Christs body* and *blood* is absolutely necessary; but there is not the same necessity of feeding upon them *Sacramentally*; and accordingly, that it is the *wilfull neglect*, not the *inevitable defect* thereof, that is damnable. The Divine *command* doth indeed impose a Necessity of Observance in all cases, where his *Providence* doth not supersede the same; and therefore they that unwillingly are depriv'd of this *intire* Ordinance may escape *Hell*, but they that willingly neglect it, cannot escape *guilt*. We onely conclude, that there is the *same* necessity of communicating in the *one* Element, as in the *other*.

3. Our asserting the Believers Right to the Sacred Cup, doth *not urge an Obligation upon such as are naturally or irremediably disabled from participation thereof.* If in an *Infant* there be an incapacity to *discern the Lords Body*; If there be an incurable *Antipathy* to the taste of Wine; If after receiving that sacred Bread, *Death* come between the Cup and the Lip, or the like; as our Doctrine obligeth not to *Impossibilities*, so all Laws that do intend a *general Obligation*, yet do admit of some extraordinary and particulars *exceptions*, especially when the Law-giver himself (as in such case he doth) creates the hindrances. Thus many have a rightfull *Interest* (*Jus ad rem*) in things, whereof they never have (*Jus in re*) the rightfull *Possession*.

Jura constituenda esse in iis quæ ὃπὶ τὸ πλεῖστον accidunt, non quæ ἐκ παραλόγου ex inopinato nec singulas personas sed generaliter constituit. Reg. Jurisconsult.

4. Our Doctrine is, That *both parts of the Lords Sacrament, by Christs Ordinance and Commandment ought to be ministred to all Christian men alike.* That *Christs Ministers ought to take and break the bread, to take the cup, and to give both to the Communicants.* That *Believers do receive what is given to them by the Lords Minister, and do eat the bread of the Lord, and drink the Cup of the Lord*; That Both *parts of the Sacrament are given to the Laity in the Lords Supper, because the Sacrament was instituted, not onely for some part of the Church, to wit, the Priests.*

Artic. 30. *Confess. Angl.* cap. 29. *Confess. Helvet.* c. 21. *August. Confess.* So the *Saxon*, *&c.*

5. We affirm, That *no man can justly infringe this Right, or deny to adult* Believers *this blessed Cup.* That *the Cup of the Lord is not to be denyed to the Lay-people.* That *the denyal of the Cup to the People is contrary to the Institution of Christ.* That *they are disallowed that withhold the One kind, to wit, the cup of the Lord from the faithfull*; yea, *they sin grievously against the Lords Institution, which saith, Drink ye all of it, which he did not say so expressely of the Bread.* That *no humane Authority ought to forbid the Appointment of Christ, and the most received custom of the ancient Church.*

Artic 30. *Confess. Angl.* c. 29. *Confess. Helvet.* c. 21. *Confess. August.*

One

One would wonder, how so *clear* an *Institution* should ever come into question; some few *Superstitious* persons, and some *Hereticks* did long agoe choose to communicate in one kind, but they were still corrected by Orthodox *Councels*. And afterwards, out of fear of shedding the blood of Christ, there were *some* that being loth to lose either Element, did use to dip the consecrated Bread in the Wine; and this some *Councels* did allow to persons that were infirm. But it was about *fourteen hundred* years after the Institution, before ever any publick contradiction was made thereunto. And then the Councel of *Constance*, then that of *Basil*, and lastly that of *Trent*, forbad the use of the *Cup*, not onely to the People, but to the *Priests* also; except to him onely that for the time officiates. They at *Constance* say, *Though Christ did administer this venerable Sacrament to his Disciples under both the kinds of* Bread *and Wine, yet notwithstanding this, the custom of communicating under one kind only is now to be taken for a Law.* Again, *Though in the Primitive Church this Sacrament was received by the faithfull under both kinds; yet notwithstanding this, the custom that is introduced of communicating under one kind onely for the Laity, is now to be taken for a Law.* They at *Basil* not many years after being warned by a *Learned* man, who was imployed to put a better face on so foul a matter, left out those strange and presumptuous *Notwithstandings*, and thus made their Canons or *Decrees*, That *the Laity, as also the Clergy who do not consecrate, are not bound by the Lords command to receive both kinds.* Again, *The Church hath power to order how the Sacrament shall be ministred; and, so that people do communicate according to the appointment of the Church, whether under one or both kinds, it is sufficient for the Salvation of the worthy Receiver.* Then come they at *Trent*, and notwithstanding all the instances of *Christian Princes*, and the Arguments of *great Divines* there to the contrary, They *declare*, That *the Laity and Clergy that do not consecrate are bound by no divine Precept to receive the Eucharist under both kinds*; and do *Accurse all those that affirm the contrary.* Again they declare, That *though at the beginning of Christianity both kinds were frequently received, yet that custom (for good Reasons) being altered, the Church now approves of Communion in one kind, which custom no man can lawfully change, without the Authority of the Church*; and do *Accurse all such as do affirm, that they do erre herein.* And this is the true state of this matter, and thus we fall at Variance:

Comperimus quòd quidam sumptâ tantummodo corporis sacri portione à calice sacrati cruoris abstinent, qui proculdubio, nescio qua *superstitione* docentur astringi, aut integra Sacramenta percipiant, aut ab integris arceantur. Quia divisio unius ejusdemq; mysterii sipe grandi sacrilegio provenire non potest. *Gelas. pap. dist. 2. de Consecr. An.* 492.

Concil. Turanens. An. 1414. *An.* 1431. *An.* 1545. *Sess.* 13.

Jo. Gerson. Sess. 30.

Sess. 21.

II. And now you you shall see the *Proof* of our *Doctrine* and *Position*, which is the *Second* thing incumbent on me, and that will be sufficiently done by these *Arguments*.

Arg. 1. *From the Institution of this Sacrament, and our Saviours Command annexed thereunto.* For Sacraments depend meerly upon their Institution;

Institution; hence doth their Being result, and upon this their matter and signification do depend. *The Institution with the Element makes the Sacrament*, and so the only Rule and Balance for them must needs be their Institution. This being the Ground of this Ordinance, no *Man or Angel* may violate under a fearfull Curse. And indeed, if mens will or wisdom might alter and change the Revelation of God, nothing would abide firm in Religion. 'Tis true, the Laws of Men may be corrected or annulled, because they foresee not their Inconveniences; but *Our Saviour* (certainly) when he appointed this Ordinance, well knew what was necessary and usefull for his Church to the end of the World. And for this Reason the *Apostle Paul*, when some disorders were broken into the Church of *Corinth* in the use of the *Lords Supper*, he recalls them to the *Institution*, and endeavours by that straight Rule to rectifie their Irregularities, 1 *Cor.* 11.23. *For I have received of the Lord*, &c. By which place it is evident, that there is no such way to obviate any mistake which in after-times creeps upon Gods own Ordinance, as by going back to the Spring, by considering the Institution: Insomuch as the *same Apostle* for their violating *Christs* Institution in their *administration* of this Ordinance, saith, 1 *Cor.* 11.20. *This is not to eat the Lords Supper.*

vid. *Cyrian* ep. 63. ad *Cæcil.*

Gal. 1.8.

Ind gnum est Domino, qui aliter mysterium celebrat, quam ab eo traditum est. Non enim potest devotus esse qui aliter præsumit, quam datum est ab Authore. *Ambros.* in 1 *Cor.* 11.

Now you may plainly see *Our Saviours Institution* in this *Text*, *Mat.* 26.27. *And he took the Cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying*, &c. And in *Luk.* 22.20. the *Evangelist* comes with a *likewise*. *Likewise also the cup after Supper*, &c. that is, As he gave the Bread, *in like manner* he gave the Cup. They have an equal ground in their first Institution; and so ought to be given to, and received by the Faithful, the one as well as the other. *What Christ hath joyned together, no man ought to put asunder.*

I shall give the substance of the *Opposition* which is made to this Branch of this Argument. To the *Antecedent*, *One* saith, *That Christ did institute many things in the Church, but not with a design to oblige every man to the use of them; it being sufficient, that some in the Church do one thing, and some another. That God in instituting of Marriage, did not intend to oblige every one to marry.*

Bellarm. de Euchar. l. 4. c. 25. *Estius* in l. 4 dist. 11. s. 8.

To this I *answer*, That the Design of our Saviour is best known by the *command* which did accompany the Institution, which is, *Drink ye all of it*; and by the *Use* the Cup was expressely designed unto in the Sacrament, which was to *keep in remembrance his Death*, and his *bloodshedding* therein; both which relating to *all* Believers alike, do make it plain, that the intent of the Institution was to oblige all Believers.

Others do say, *That though Christ did institute this Sacrament in both kinds, yet the Church hath power to alter his Institution; alleadging, that the like was done in the case of* Baptisme, *which being appointed to be administred in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, was afterwards done onely in the Name of the Lord Jesus*, Act. 19.5.

Reffers in refut. art. 16. *Lutheri.*

To which I *answer*, That the *Holy Ghost* doth not in the place specified

fied, describe the manner *how* Baptism was celebrated, but sheweth that they there were baptized in the Name (that is, according to the Doctrine and Appointment) of the Lord Jesus. It no more intends, that they were baptized *onely* in *Christs* Name, than St. *Pauls* stiling himself the Servant of *Jesus Christ*, excludes the *Father* and the *Holy Ghost*. And thus it is understood not onely by the *Ancients*, but by divers of the *learnedst* of the *Roman* Church themselves.

Photius Bibl. p. 1603. *ex Eulog.* *Estius* in l. 4. d. 3. s. 4. *Fabr. Paulus.* in Act. 19. *D. Soto* in tertiam dist. 4i. art. 6.

To make sure the *consequent*, That *our Saviour* did institute this Sacrament in both kinds for all Believers, I adde hereunto the *command of our Saviour* at the Institution of it, *Matt.* 26. 27. *Drink ye all of it.* 1 *Cor.* 11. 25. *This do ye as oft as ye drink it.* The Institution is *Dogmatical*, layes down the Law; but this is *preceptive*, and charges the Execution of it. Which Command could not be terminated in those present Apostles, but extendeth to all Believers to the End of the World; for so saith the Apostle, *by so doing, ye do shew the Lords death till he come.* And without doubt, if one of the Elements be sequestred from Believers, then must by the same reason the other also; for the *Apostle* saith, *After the same manner also he took the cup, and delivered it*, and commanded the same use of it, just as he had done before of the Bread.

I shall not stand upon that *Observation* of the express mentioning of [*All*] when the Cup was given; the like not added when the Bread was delivered: as if *our Saviour* had on set purpose added that word, to confute the Sacriledge which he foresaw would be committed about it. It is sufficient, that here is a plain Command to all that had eaten the Bread, to drink *in like manner of the Cup.* And if this do not indispensibly oblige both the *Apostles* there present, and also all Believers after them till *Christ* come again; there is no ground for the administring of either Element to any whomsoever at this day, which is directly contrary to the *Apostles Inference* from hence, and to all mens sentiment, that have not quit both their *Religion* and *Reason*.

1 Cor. 11.

Jac. a S. Maria, ser. 7. de solen. corp. Christi.

Suarez. Disp. 71. de Sacr.

And yet behold what Subterfuges they that would be mad with Reason have found out to avoid our Lords Command. *First*, they say, *This onely, imports a liberty given hereby, such as that, Increase and multiply, which layes no Obligation upon every one to marry for the increase of the World.* Or as *others*, *This is onely an Invitation, such as that, Receive ye the Holy Ghost, but no command.*

Which Comments do not onely deprive the People of the blessed Cup, but do release both Ministers and People from both Elements; for (the Fate of both being just the same) where there is no Command, or Law, there is no transgression. And were it but an *invitation*, yet as they manage it, it is not very civil: For the Priest saith, *Drink ye all of it*, and when he hath so said, he drinks it all himself. If it be said, *That all others did drink in and by the Apostles; and now do drink in and by the Priest:* It must needs follow, that in their eating, all others do eat, and then there is no need of either.

Obj.

Obj. 2. They ſay, *That this command did onely concern them that were preſent, or at furtheſt, that it onely concluded with the Apoſtles their Succeſſors.* *Bellarm. de Euchar. lib. 4. cap. 25.*

Anſ. A poor Refuge. For then [*take, eat*] onely concerned them alſo; and ſo they give the other Element to the people without any warrant. And ſo alſo will they exclude even their Prieſts themſelves that do not adminiſter, from the Cup; whereas for all that, they pretend to be Succeſſors to the Apoſtles; for the Apoſtles at that time did not adminiſter, and ſo did rather repreſent the People, or Non-officiating Miniſters, than any elſe. But we affirm, whoever ſucceeds the *Apoſtles* in their *Faith*, though they ſucceed them not in their *Office*, have a Right to the blood of Chriſt in the Sacrament; foraſmuch as they all have a right in the New Covenant or Teſtament, whereof that Cup is a Seal, and are all commanded to drink it in Remembrance of his Death, till he come.

Obj. 3. They ſay, *That this is an Affirmative Precept, and therefore binds not alwayes, but when there is a neceſſity; but in the Church of* Rome *there is no ſuch neceſſity, for there they are all content without it.* *Cajetan in tertiam Tho. q. 80. art. 12.*

Anſ. But to this we *anſwer*. The Command for conſecrating the bread and wine is alſo affirmative, which yet to omit, they hold a crime; ſo alſo is the Precept of receiving the Bread affirmative; yet by this Rule there would lie no Obligation from the Precept on any, in either of theſe caſes. Affirmative Commands do alwayes binde, though not to the performance of them at all times: and it were a ſtrange way to evade them by making a *Law on Earth*, that none ſhould deſire to fulfill the *Laws of Heaven*.

Obj. 4. They alleadge, *That our Saviour ſaid not at the giving of the cup, Do this; nor the Apoſtle* Paul, *But as oft as ye drink it*; that is, *when ye do drink it, do it in remembrance of me: and this they triumph in, as a wonderful Providence of God in ſo deſcribing it.* *Eſtius l. 4. diſt. 11. §. 7. Bellarm. de Euchar. l. 4. c. 25.*

Anſ. But the *anſwer* is eaſie, 1. This word (*as oft as*) is alſo applyed to the Bread, as well, and in the ſame manner as to the Cup; *As oft as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup.* 2. The Command of *Doing this* is clearly implyed in ſaying [as oft as ye do it]: for he that commands to do it *worthily*, doth imply a Command to *do it*. And, 3. If *Do this* were not included in (*as oft as ye do it*) there would be no ground to adminiſter the Cup to any Perſon at all in the Church.

It remains then, that by vertue of our Saviours *Inſtitution* a *Right* accrues, and by vertue of his *Command* an *Obligation* lies upon Believers to partake of the bleſſed Cup in the Lords Supper.

Arg. 2. The *ſecond Argument* is taken from the *Example* and *Appointment* of the *Apoſtles*. Their *Example* is plain, *Mark* 14. 23. *And they all drank of it*. Though the Blood of Chriſt was yet in his Body, yet they plainly followed the Inſtitution, and ſtood not upon the Notion

of *concomitance*. And leſt any ſhould ſay, that their drinking of that Cup gives no Right or Ground for us to do the like, I adde conjunctly therewith, the *direction* and *appointment* of the great Apoſtle of the Gentiles, 1 *Cor.* 11. 25. *This do ye as oft as ye drink it*, &c. where drinking of the Cup is joyn'd with eating the Bread *five* or *ſix* times in *five* Verſes together.

And this Order is conſiderable, if we mark 1. *From what hand* the Apoſtle *received* it, which you may ſee *Verſ.* 23. *For I have received of the Lord, that which alſo I have delivered unto you.* Could he have had it from a better and furer hand? This he received of the *Lord*, let others conſider of whom they have received the contrary: yea, this came from the *Lord Jeſus* when he was in *Heaven*; they that bring another Doctrine, ſurely had it delivered from *Hell*. 2. Mark *unto whom this Order is directed*; and theſe were, the *Body* of the Church of *Corinth*, not the *Miniſters* onely: yea and not onely to that Church, but to *all that in every place call upon the Name of Jeſus Chriſt our Lord*, as you may ſee 1 *Cor.* 1. 2. And though every thing in that Epiſtle was not intended for every one, yet this muſt needs be intended to regulate all thoſe that were guilty of that diſorder, or in danger to be corrupted by it; and thoſe were the ordinary Members of that Church, and others after them. And *He* was no Novice that thus argues from the 28th *Verſ.* He that is bound to *examine himſelf*, is bound alſo to drink of that Cup; but not the Miniſters onely, but the People are bound to examine themſelves; they therefore are bound to drink of it. And, 3. Mark, *to what End the Inſtitution is here deſcribed* and *urged*, which though it was not to prove *this point* in queſtion, yet it was to regulate another diſorder, which was grown among the *Corinthians*; and this he doth by reducing them to the *firſt Standard*; and therefore cannot be imagined to be either *defective* or *ſuperfluous* in his Deſcription. It is but weakly ſaid, that the *Apoſtle* did not *command* this Practice, but *delivered* it; whereas he *delivered* the *command* of our *Saviour Chriſt*, and that is enough.

Pic. 1 Cathol. Orth. p. 119.

Bellarm. de Euchar. l. 4. c. 25.

I find but two *Objections* worth the naming againſt this *Argument*.

Eſtius in l. 4. d. 11. ſ. 7.

Obj. 1. That *the Apoſtle doth leave the Cup in ſome indifference, for-aſmuch as he ſaith once*, verſ. 17. *Whoſoever ſhall eat this bread* [*or*] (for ſo it is in the *Greek*) *drink this cup of the Lord unworthily.*

Anſ. But it is moſt evident that this (*or*) is uſed here in a *copulative* ſence; onely that word was fitter here, not to *untie* the two Elements, which the *Apoſtle* had bound together by ſo many Copulatives in the *Text*, but to ſhew that an *equal* care and reverence ſhould be ſhewed in both. It is as if he had ſaid, If a man do *either eat the Bread* or *drink the Cup unworthily*, he is guilty. And of this genuine acception a multitude of Inſtances may be given in the *Scripture*.

Matth. 18, 8. &c.

Obj. 2. Others do *grant, that it was the cuſtom at* Corinth, *to celebrate this Sacrament in both kinds*, but they ſay, *that this preſcribes not to others; for that the Church may abrogate ſuch a cuſtom upon ſuffi-*

Salmeron tom. 9. trac. 34.

sufficient Reasons, her Power being not inferiour to the Apostles.

Ans. But to this we say, That this was the *Rule* that St. *Paul* received from *Jesus Christ*, and which he left for the Direction of the Church of God *untill Christ shall come.* And this was then the *Practice* of the *Universal Church*: and themselves grant, that no man can dispense 1. In the *Lawes of Nature*, nor 2. In *Articles of Faith*, nor 3. In the *Sacraments of the New Testament.* *Aquin.* Quodl. 4. art. 13. *Salmeron* ubi supra.

It remains then, that according to the *Example* and *appointment* of the *Apostles*, who were guided by the *holy Ghost* himself, the Sacred Cup was as plainly intended for all Christian men as the holy Bread.

Arg. 3. The *Third Argument* is taken from the *proper End of this Ordinance of the Lords Supper*; which is to keep up *the remembrance*, or to *shew the Lords Death till he come*, 1 *Cor.* 11. 25, 26. They who are bound to the End, are also bound to the Means. Every adult Believer is bound to shew the Lords death, which is the *End*; therefore every adult Believer is bound to partake of the Cup in the Lords Supper, which is the *Means* to that End. For so the *Apostle* saith expressely, *vers.* 25. *This do ye as oft as ye drink it in remembrance of me*, and *vers.* 26. *as oft as ye------ drink this Cup, ye doe shew the Lords Death till he come.*

Now although *our Saviours* choice of this Means for this End, be sufficient to evince the *Necessity* and *Fitness* thereof, where it may be had; yet *ex abundanti* it is easie to shew the same from the thing it self. For the Death of our Redeemer coming with the pouring out of his Blood, how can that Death be shewed sufficiently without drinking that Cup poured out in the Sacrament? For the breaking of the Bread doth in no wise represent the effusion of the Blood; that must be done by communicating in the Cup.

I finde but *two Pleas* entred against this *Argument*, and they are these.

Obj. 1. They say, *That* [Do this] *referres not to the Peoples drinking of the Cup, but to the Ministers consecrating it, whereby Christs Death is sufficiently shewed.* Or as others, *These words did consecrate them to be Priests, and so enable to celebrate this Ordinance.* *Cajetan.* ubi supra. *Al. Pigh.* contr. *Rutil.* 7. *Conc. Trid.* Sess. 22. c. 1.

Ans. That the words [*Do this*] are a sufficient ground for the Ministers consecrating and distributing both the Elements, is very true; but that hereby they were constituted in that Office, is wholly groundless. This being *another business* Our *Saviour* was now about, and there being more plain and formal passages otherwhere in the *New Testament* for that purpose. And then, as to the other conceit, that this onely obligeth the Minister to consecrate both Elements; it neither stands with *reason* nor *construction* of *speech*, to make that Interpretation of it. Not with *Reason* of the thing; for how shall the People who are here directed, shew the Lords death by the Priests consecrating the Cup? Not with good *construction*; for the blessing and delivering being mentioned Matth. 28. 19. Joh. 20. 21, 22, 23.

or ſuppoſed before, [*Do this*] muſt needs referre to both; or if but to the one, rather to the latter, than the former. And if the Miniſter muſt deliver both, the People then are bound to receive them.

Eſtius in l: 4. d. 11. ſ. 8.

Obj. 2. They ſay again, *That either of the Elements are ſufficient to commemorate the Death of Chriſt; inaſmuch as it is ſaid of either of them apart, ye do hereby ſhew the Lords death.*

Anſ. It is eaſily granted, that we may commemorate the Death of Chriſt by either of them, yea without either of them: but we urge, that they were both inſtituted to this end, and therefore that it cannot be ſufficiently ſhewed by one of them. He that ſaith *meat* is deſigned for the maintaining of life, denyes not *drink* alſo to be requiſite to the ſame end: Yea though we ſhould grant, that the blood might be received in the Bread; yet by ſuch receiving, the *Death* of Chriſt by the effuſion of his blood for us, could in no wiſe be ſhewed forth: which being the *principal End* of the Sacrament, it is the Peoples Duty as well as the Miniſters to do it, and that till our Saviour come again.

Arg. 4. The *Fourth Argument* is taken from *the Peoples Right in the Thing ſignified by the ſacred cup in the Lords Supper.* And this is us'd by our *Saviour* himſelf, *Mat.* 26. 27, 28. *Drink ye all of this* [For] *this is my blood*, &c. So that look what *benefit* a man would be robbed of, in being deprived of Chriſts blood; that *comfort* he is robbed of, that is deprived of this Cup. And that a Right to the thing *ſignified*, creates a Right to the *Sign*, is ſo great a Truth, that the Apoſtle *Peter* grounds his Practice upon it, where there was no expreſs Rule. *Can any man forbid water to theſe that have received the Holy Ghoſt*, &c. It is true, where there lies a preſent incapacity to receive the outward Ordinance, for want of a requiſite Condition that is annexed thereunto (as there is in Infants, and ſuch like, that cannot yet diſcern the Lords Body, nor examine themſelves,) in that caſe, their Right is ſuſpended: but no *mortal man* can lawfully forbid to thoſe that have an intereſt in that which the Cup ſignifies, the liberty of Drinking of it.

Cui ſignatum ei ſignum.

Act. 10. 47.

Now what is ſignified and exhibited by the Sacred Cup? the Apoſtle ſaith, 1 *Cor.* 10. 16. *The cup of bleſſing which we bleſs, is it not the communion of the blood of Chriſt?* And every Believer, that hath a right to the *Body* of Chriſt, hath alſo a right to the *Blood* of Chriſt: They that have Union with Chriſt by Faith, have a clear right to the Communion of his Blood. Again, in the Inſtitution, *Luk.* 22. 20. *This cup is the New Teſtament in my blood, which is ſhed for you.* For whom the Blood is *ſhed*, to them the Cup muſt be *given*; and the rather, in that it was appointed to aſſure a poor Believer thereof; who may ſay, Doth the Covenant of Grace belong to me? was his blood ſhed for ſuch a poor ſinner as I am? Now *Jeſus Chriſt* comes in this Ordinance to ſeal and apply to every particular Soul the general Promiſe and Mercy; and in effect ſaith, *Behold ſinner, this Blood was ſhed for thee, for the remiſſion of thy ſin.*

Si quotieſcunque effunditur ſanguis Chriſti, in remiſſionem peccatorum effunditur, debeo illum ſemper ſumere, ut ſemper peccata mihi demittantur *Gratian de conſecr. diſt.* 2.

There

There are but *two*, and they very weak *Objections* found against this *Argument*.

Obj. 1. They say, *That Abstemious persons that can drink no Wine, that Infants within the Church, yea that all men have a title to Christs blood, in that he shed it for all men; and yet these may not partake of the Cup in the Lords Supper.* Bellarm. de Euchar. l. 4. c. 25.

Ans. This *Objection* was prevented before, by observing, that in the cases of Infants and abstemious Persons, *God* himself hath by his Providence at present hindred them from participation hereof, and that by a natural incapacity: And for any others out of the Church, as they can pretend no right to his *Blood*, till they acknowledge his *Person*, so they cannot discern the Lords Body or Blood, or examine themselves.

Obj. 2. They tell us, *That they who have the thing signified, need not to strive so much about the sign; he that hath the Money promised by the Bond, is not solicitous at all for the Bond.* Bellarm. de Euchar. l. 4. c. 27.

Ans. This inded is the ready way to cast off all Sacraments and Ordinances at once; but our Saviour, that knew our weakness of Faith and Love, did institute both these external Elements to strengthen and comfort us. We are made partakers of Christ by *Baptisme*, by the *Word*, by *Faith*; but infinite Wisdom and Love did concurre to appoint this method for the Churches good; and who are we to correct our Blessed *Saviour*, or to intimate that his Institutions are needless?

Seeing therefore that to all true Believers doth belong the thing signified by the Cup in the Sacrament, and that by Gods Ordinance; no man can or ought to forbid them the Sign or Seal thereof.

I might easily multiply *Arguments*, from the *sacred Nature of Testaments*, especially of this *New Testament*, which was sealed with the Blood of the *Testator*. *For though it be but a mans Covenant, yet if it be confirmed, no man disannulleth or addeth thereto, Gal.* 3. 15. that is, no man can do it without the greatest injury and sacriledge: how much greater is the injury, that is offered to our *Saviour*, who said, *This is the Cup of the New Testament in my Blood, which is shed for you*; and who did bequeath both the *sign* and the *thing signified?*

As also from the unwarrantable *Mutilation*, that they who withhold the Cup, do make in the Sacrament. For it is not an *intire* Sacrament, when one *integral* part is wanting; no more than a man is a perfect man, when one Arm or Eye is defective; Nature alwayes ordaining those parts to be double, though both serving to the same use; and implying thereby, that their Operation is more compleat in both, than it can be in one only: And with the like Wisdom (no doubt) our *Blessed Redeemer* appointed these *two* Elements of Bread and Wine for the intire refreshment of the Soul. But especially when one *Essential* part (as the Cup is, being part of the matter) is taken away, one may truely say, *This is not to eat the Lords Supper.* And besides, nothing is more plain than Christs intention to appoint a *refection* to the Soul *like that of the Body*: all men know,

know, that this is by *drink*, as well as by *meat*; the one whereof quenches thirſt, and the other repells hunger, and therefore both theſe muſt be uſed to ſignifie a perfect Feaſt or refreſhment, ſuch as *our Saviour* provides for his People.

I had alſo thought to have ſpread before you the univerſal and uncontrouled *Practice* of the Church of God from the *Apoſtles* time for 1300 years and more downwards, for the uſe of the bleſſed Cup by all true Believers in the Lords Supper; And not onely of their *uſe* thereof, but of their *arguments* for its uſe. At leaſt I intended to have produced *one* undoubted *Teſtimony* in each *Century* of years to have witneſſed hereunto; but onely, that this would ſwell this Diſcourſe beyond the prescribed limits, and that it is done already by many learned men. Thus much ſhall ſuffice for the ſecond Thing, to wit, the proof of our *Doctrine* or *Poſition*.

Chemnit. Chamier. de Euchar. l. 8. c. 9.

Before I come to anſwer the *Objections* made againſt this *Doctrine*, I ſhould have ſet before you the *Confeſſions* of the Adverſe Party; where *very many learned men* do acknowledge, both the firſt Inſtitution and primitive Practice to be in both Kinds; but having heard already the verdict brought in for us herein by *one* of their own *Councels*, I ſhall onely adde the *Obſervation* of a moſt *ſober* and *learned Perſon*, that lived and died in the Communion of the *Church of Rome*, who writes to this purpoſe. "Concerning the Adminiſtra- "tion of the Holy Sacrament of the *Euchariſt*, it is ſufficiently known, "that the *Univerſal Church* hath to this day, and the *Weſtern* or *Ro-* "*man* Church for above a thouſand years after *Chriſt* (eſpecially in their "ſolemn and ordinary diſpenſing of this Sacrament) given both Bread "and Wine to all the Members of Chriſts Church, a thing that is mani- "feſt by innumerable teſtimonies both of the *Greek* and *Latine* Anci- "ents. And they were induced ſo to doe, *firſt* by the Inſtitution and "Example of *Chriſt*, who gave this Sacrament of his Body and Blood "to his Diſciples, then repreſenting the Perſons of Believers, *&c.* And after, "Wherefore it is not without cauſe, that the beſt and moſt learned "Catholicks do moſt earneſtly deſire and contend, that they may receive "the Sacrament of Chriſts Blood together with his Body, according to "the ancient Cuſtom continued in the Univerſal Church for many "Ages.

Aquin. in 1 Cor. 11. *Eſtius* in l. 4. d. 11. ſ. 7. *Tolet.* in Joh. 6. annot. 27. *Olim permulta ſecula apud omnes Catholicos uſitatum eſſe, ex multorum ſanctorum Scripturis didiſcimus.* Alph. à Caſtr. adv. Hæreſ. ult. de Euchar.

Caſſard. Conſult. Artic. 22.

Behold here an acknowledgement ſo plain and full, that I wonder with what countenance men can reſiſt ſo manifeſt a Truth, and *withhold it in unrighteouſneſs*. And yet here they muſter up the beſt ſtrength they have, and will not yield an inch of what they have once eſtabliſhed, be it right or wrong. We ſhall reduce their *Objections* that are either alleadged in their *Councels*, or produced by their *Writers* to theſe *Four heads*, which is the next thing to be done.

III.

1. *Pre-*

1. *Pretence of Scripture.*
2. *Pretence of Reaſon.*
3. *Pretence of Reverence.*
4. *Pretence of Authority.*

The *Scriptures* which they produce for Communion under *one kind*, are ſuch as theſe. Object. 1.

(1) *The Types and Figures of the Euchariſt in the Old Teſtament, ſignifie eating under one Kind; As the Tree of Life in Paradiſe, The Paſchal Lamb; The Manna; The Shew-bread; The Sacrifices, where the fleſh was to be eaten, but the blood was not drunk.* Bellarm. de Euchar. l. 4. c. 24.

Anſ. The weakneſs of this *Objection* would be obvious, if it were put into an *Argument*; but it is not worth that trouble. It is ſufficient to anſwer, 1. That none of theſe were Types or Figures of the Lords Supper, and ſo their whole force is loſt in reference unto that. For Types are ſhadowes to repreſent the ſubſtance, but it is uncouth Divinity, to make one Figure the Type of another. And *our Saviour* is plainly cal'd the *Paſchal Lamb*, and calls himſelf the *Mannah* that came down from Heaven, *&c.*

And, 2. If there were ſome Types that onely intimated *eating*, yet there were others that doe imply *drinking* alſo. Was there a *tree of Life* in Paradiſe? ſo are there *Rivers* of Paradiſe. Was there *Bread* from Heaven? ſo were there *Waters* flowing from the *Rock*. And divers of the *Fathers* will produce a clearer figure of both, than any of theſe, and that was of *Melchizedek*, who brought forth *both Bread and Wine* to feaſt faithful *Abraham*. And the *Apoſtle* tells us; *As they did all eat the ſame ſpiritual meat, ſo they all drank the ſame ſpiritual drink*; and *Chryſoſtom* ſaith upon it, *As thou eateſt the Body of our Lord, ſo they did eat Manna; and as thou drinkeſt the Blood of our Lord, ſo they drank the Water of the Rock. To them he gave Manna and Water, to thee he gives his Body and Blood.* 1 Cor. 10. 2, 3. *In loc.*

(2) *The ſecond Pretence of Scripture is from* Joh. 6. *where Chriſt ſaith*, verſ. 41. I am the Bread which came down from Heaven. *And* verſ. 50. This is the Bread which came down from Heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not dye. *And* verſ. 51. If a man eat of this Bread, he ſhall live for ever. *By all which paſſages he teacheth one kind to be ſufficient to ſalvation, eſpecially when in the ſame chapter verſ.* 11. *our Saviour multiplyed the Bread, but not the Drink.* Bellarm. de Euch. l. 4. c. 24.

Anſ. 1. Though divers of the *Ancients* did apply this Scripture to the buſineſs of the Sacrament, yet properly it cannot intend that; the Sacrament not being inſtituted till above a year after this diſcourſe of his: but plainly enough by Bread he means *himſelf*: It was *He*, not the Sacramental Bread *that came down from Heaven*. 'Tis a ſpiritual feeding on *him* by Faith, not meerly partaking of *Bread* in the Sacrament, that will *make a man live for ever*. And he ſpeaketh ſo often of *Bread*, onely in

purſuance of the *Manna* which he had begun to ſpeak of; as in *Joh.* 4. he purſues the ſame thing under another ſhadow, to wit, of *water*, to the Woman of *Samaria*.

2. But if this place were meant of the Lords Supper, we cannot have a ſtronger *Argument* for the neceſſity of the *cup* therein, than from *verſ.* 53. where *Chriſt* ſaith, *Except ye eat the fleſh of the Son of God, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you*; the like *verſ.* 54, 56. And then for the Miracle, as there is no ground to affirm, that that Miracle had any myſtical reference in it to the Lords Supper; ſo if it had, we might inferre as well, that his multiplying the Wine, *Joh.* 2. in *Cana*, doth as ſtrongly prove, and both alike, that we muſt communicate in *Wine* onely.

Bellarm. de Euchar. l. 4. c. 24.

(3) *The Third pretence of Scripture is from* Luk. 24. 30, 31. *Where it is ſaid*, that Our Saviour as he ſate at meat, took Bread, and bleſſed it, and brake, and gave it to them. And their eyes were opened, and they knew him, and he vaniſhed out of their ſight. *Here, ſay they, was the Sacrament*; *here was onely breaking of Bread*; *here could be no partaking of the Cup, for that he vaniſhed immediately out of their ſight.*

Eſtius in lib 4. d. 8. s. 11.

Anſ. 1. Here is no *direct* proof of the Sacrament: No ſaying, *This is my Body*; *Do this in remembrance of me*, which they grant to be neceſſary to a Sacrament. In other Scriptures, as *Mat.* 14. 19. & 15. 36. where there was no thought of a Sacrament, *Our Saviour* took Bread, and gave thanks, and gave it. Nay, here is great probability to the contrary; for this was in an Inne, their meeting and eating there not at all intended Sacramentally, no Wine conſecrated (which the Opponents ſay, is neceſſary.) That their *eyes were opened*, and they knew him *in the breaking of bread*, is no proof that it was the Sacrament; but rather, that then they did more ſtedfaſtly look upon him; and that breaking of Bread noteth the *time when*, not the *cauſe by which* they knew him; or poſſibly by his uſual manner of *Giving thanks*, and *breaking of the Bread*, they diſcerned who he was. And according to the ſence of this Anſwer, do ſpeak many learned *Expoſitors* even of their own.

Vid. *Suarez.* d. ſp. 71. de Sacr.

D. *Carthuſian.* in loc. *Janſen.* conc. Evang. c. 146.

2. Though it ſhould be granted, that here the Lords Supper was adminiſtred, yet it is apparent by the former anſwer, that here is no *full deſcription* of the Celebration of it: So that the Cup might as well be given though not expreſs'd, as that thoſe Diſciples did drink at their meal, though no ſuch thing be there mention'd. Neither is the Relation of an *Example* in an extraordinary caſe, ſufficient to cancel a direct *Precept* and cleer *Example* with it. The ſound uſe of the Notion of *concomitance* would here do well, to wit, that if this Phraſe do denote the Lords Supper, then both kinds (by an uſual *Synechdoche*) are meant, when onely one is mention'd.

Bellarm. de Euch. l. 4. c. 24.

(4) *The Fourth Pretence of Scripture is from* Act. 2. 42, 46. & 20. 7. *where it is ſaid*, *The Diſciples* continued in the Apoſtles Doctrine, and Fellowſhip, and breaking of Bread------ *And that* they were daily breaking

ing Bread from houſe to houſe. *And that* they met on the firſt day of the week, to break Bread. *In which places the Lords Supper is deſcribed only by breaking of Bread, not a word of the Cup.*

Anſ. 1. It is not certain that under theſe expreſſions is meant the Celebration of the Lords Supper, (the more inconſiderate they who affect to term the Lords Supper nothing but *breaking of Bread*, when the Scripture hath given it a more ſpecifical and honourable Name) for ſome of the *Learned* underſtand ſeveral of thoſe places, of diſtributing their proviſion to thoſe that were in want, or of their common refection together; *Their communion* (ſaith *Chryſoſt.*) *was with the Apoſtles not only in Prayers, but alſo in Doctrine and civil Converſation*; Or elſe of their *Agapæ* or *Love-feaſts*, which were frequently held at the end of their Aſſemblies. *Cajetan* in loc. *Beza* in loc. In loc. Serm. 6.

2. But if any of thoſe places do point out the Lords Supper, we *anſwer*, that by a common *Synechdoche*, the one kind is put for both; nothing being more uſual in Scripture, than to denote a compleat ſuſtenance by *eating of Bread*, *Iſa.* 58. 6, 7. *Luk.* 14. 1. which may the rather convince our Opponents, in that their *Councel of Conſtance*, as they urged none of theſe places to this purpoſe, ſo they expreſſely yield, that this Sacrament was both inſtituted and uſed in the Primitive Church in both kinds: and it muſt be a clear and certain evidence, that muſt croſs the Inſtitution. Some few more *Scriptures* are pretended, but being wholly inconſiderable to this purpoſe, I think not worth the anſwering.

The Second Plea that is brought for Communion in one Kind, is from a Pretence of Reaſon. For, ſay they, *the whole Eſſence of a Sacrament is comprized in one Kind*; *and whole Chriſt, who is the Fountain of all Grace (both his Divinity and Humanity being now inſeparably united together) is by way of* Concomitance, *his blood being now in his Body, exhibited in one Kind*; *ſo that there is no ſpiritual Fruit to be reaped by both, that is not to be received by participating of one kind*; *and therefore there is no need of both.* Object. 2. *Bellarm.* de Euchar. l. 4. c. 22. *Bellarm.* de Euch. l. 4 c. 21. Id. c. 23.

Anſ. 1. We deny that the whole Eſſence of the Lords Supper is comprized under one Kind; for there is neither the *whole Sign*, the Cup being wanting, which ſignifies Chriſts Blood; nor the *whole thing ſignified*, which is ſuch an intire refreſhment of Soul, as Bread and Wine are of the Body. The Lords Supper is the Sacrament of Chriſts Body and Blood; but Bread is not the Sacrament of Chriſts Body and Blood; therefore Bread alone is not the Lords Supper. *Bonavent.* in lib. 4. d. 11. p. 2. a. 1. q 2.

2. The Doctrine of *natural concomitance* preſuppoſeth Chriſts Natural Body to be contained *carnaliy* under the form of Bread, which will not only be denyed, but plainly diſproved. Where Chriſts natural humane body is, there we grant, his Blood, and Soul, and Divinity alſo are, but that Body is now only in Heaven.

3. They who urge this Conceit, yet do grant, that *by vertue of the*

Aquin. p. 3. q. 76. a. 2. Corpus Christi non est sacramentaliter sub specie vini, nec Sanguis sacramentaliter sub specie panis. Ergo ut sacramentaliter sumatur Christus, necesse est, ut sumatur sub duabus speciebus. *Alex. Alens.* 4 part. q. 11. m. 2.

Sacramental words, only Christs Body is contained under the form of Bread; and then we conclude, that whole Christ is not therein *Sacramentally*. Christs body is not Sacramentally signified by the Wine; neither is the Communion of Christs Blood in this Sacrament, a work of Nature, but depends meerly on the Institution and Promise of Christ, and to be measured thereby.

4. Though his Body be now accompanyed with blood in Heaven, yet this Sacrament was instituted to shew the Passion of Christ when he was on Earth, which was with the pouring out of his blood; and blood poured out of the veins cannot be said to accompany or be conjoyned to the body. Our Saviour would represent himself here not as *a Lamb*, but a *Lamb sacrificed*, and therefore the blood is severed from the body: As the Money is not a Prisoners Ransome, while it lies in the Chest, but when it is paid; so the blood of Christ *as shed*, is our Ransome. And though now his blessed body and blood cannot be severed asunder, yet the *Signs* of them are by his own appointment severed, and no man can drink the blood of Christ in eating of the bread. *The bread we break is the communion of his body*, and *the cup we blesse*, *is* still *the communion of his blood.* And themselves affirm, that their Efficacy is but commensurate to their Significancy, and it is manifest, that the bread doth only signifie the body of Christ, the wine only his blood.

Vasquez t. 3 in 3 disp. 215. c. 2. Illa tamen, quæ est sub duabus, est majoris meriti, tum ratione augmentationis devotionis, tum ratione fidei dilatationis actualis tum ratione sumptionis completionis. *Alex. Hilens.* part 4. q. 11. m. 2. So *Vasquez.*

5. Though no more profit were to be received by partaking of one kind, than of both (which yet some of *their own* deny, who say, that more *Devotion* is raised, more *Faith* exercised, and a more compleat *refreshment* obtain'd by both than by one) yet more humble *obedience* is expressed to the will of the *Law-giver*, who appointed both, and thereby shewed the use and need of both.

Object. 3. *Bell.* de Euch. l. 4. c. 24.

The *Third Objection* that is made against the peoples use of the Sacred Cup, is *Pretence of Reverence to the Blood of Christ, which by the promiscuous use of the* Cup, *might easily be spilt*; *especially where there is but one Dispenser of the Sacrament, and many* Communicants; *that it would be lost on the long Beards of the Laity*; *that being kept long, it would grow musty*; *and that to impropriate it to the* Clergy, *would at the same time preserve a great Reverence both to it and to Them also in the eyes of the Vulgar.*

Ans. 1. God forbid that any of us should conceive, or express any thing irreverently of our dear Redeemers Blood; no nor of the outward sign thereof. But doth not this *Objection* reflect upon the *Author* of this Sacrament, that did so institute it, and upon all the Ancient Church that so used it, and yet such danger in it? yea, who communicated, and that in great numbers, at the least, every Lords Day? And may not the sacred Bread fall down and perish in like manner? But this pretence many of the *Fathers* in their own *Trent-Councel* smiled at; well knowing that the Church for above a thousand years in her greatest straits and persecu-

Histor. Conc. Trid. p. 585.

tions

tions, kept up a *due reverence* together with the *conſtant uſe* of this Sacred Cup.

2. But the *ſecond part* of the *Objection* is not ſo eaſily anſwered; namely, that by this reſtraint, the *honour of the Clergy*, who are one time or other partakers of it, may more ſhine forth. For it is eaſier to anſwer ten arguments, than one corrupt affection. But this is the wrong way of contracting Reverence and Reſpect; for men thus *to ſeek their own Glory, is not Glory*; nor can any man expect, that God will bleſs thoſe methods, that do ſo plainly croſs his *will*. And indeed this very thing, the *Clergies honour* and that *proud fear of being thought fallible* in any thing, leſt Truth ſhould get further ground, together with their *ill-naturedneſs*, that therefore will deny a thing, becauſe others deſire it, are the greateſt *reaſons* of the preſent Church of *Rome* for this their Sacriledge.

The *Fourth Pretence* they have, is of *Authority*. They ſay, *That the cuſtom of communicating under one kind, being rationally introduced, and long obſerved; the Church having now a greater liberty, than the Church had under the Law, though ſhe have no power to alter things of a Moral, but only ſuch as are of a Poſitive nature, hath fixed it as a Law in ſeveral Councils, and therefore it is to be ſo received and obeyed. And in caſe of diſobedience, the ſecular Arm is to be called in, which one of them confeſſes in this caſe to be the moſt neceſſary Argument.* Object. 4. *Bell.* de Euch. l. 4. c. 28. *Gerſon.*

Anſ. 1. That ſuch a cuſtom of communicating under one kind is crept into ſome part of the Church, is certainly true; but that it was *rationally* introduced, or hath been *anciently* uſed, is certainly falſe. For how can that be uſher'd in with any *reaſon*, which is directly againſt Chriſts *command?* whenas alſo every ſucceeding Councel is aſhamed of the grounds their Predeceſſors went upon; and one might referre it to any man that is not drunk with prejudice, whether there be one good Reaſon for this alteration among all the number. And that it hath been for a long time uſed, is ſo falſe, that Authentick Writers in every age of the Church ſtand ready at a call to evince, that the ordinary and publick celebration of this Sacrament was ſtill in both Kinds. The *Roman* cauſe being moſt indefenſible in this point, even by their own uſual Weapons. Vid. *Catech. Rom.* p. 2. pag. 201.

2. The Univerſal Church of God hath no Authority to prohibit what God commands. In *alterable* circumſtances, ſhe may wiſely and modeſtly uſe her power; but to change the Teſtamentary Inſtitution of Chriſt her Lord and Husband, ſhe will not dare. *What the Maſter commands, the good Servant will not forbid.* St. *Paul* ſaith, *the Church is ſubject to Chriſt*, and therefore may not oppoſe her ſelf to Chriſt: for that (as *Aug.*) *he alwayes determines aright, but Eccleſiaſtical Judges, as men, are often miſtaken.* The Miniſters of Chriſt are indeed the *Diſpenſers* of the Myſteries of God, but not *Lords* to diſpenſe with them and alter them at their pleaſure, but muſt diſpenſe them according to Chriſts Inſtitution. Contr. *Creſcon.* l. 2. c. 21.

Institution. And then for the Churches liberty, it consists in having fewer and more easie Ordinances than under the Law, and Grace to make her members willing to perform them; but it consists not in an uncontrolled power to adde, alter, or diminish the Institutions of Christ. *He that breaketh the least command, and teacheth so, hath no place in the Kingdom of Heaven.* The *Roman* Priest may not alter or omit one Ceremony in the *Mass*, and must they adventure to omit this sacred Symbol of Christ's appointment?

3. The Determination of the *Church of Rome* is nothing to the *Universal Church*; being not a *fourth* part thereof, nor having any Jurisdiction over other Churches by any Law of God. These pretended Councils that have so boldly determined against the plain Word of God, have also herein opposed former Councils; in which case *Themselves* tell us, that if Councils are at odds with one another, and their Definitions irreconcileable, we ought to take part with the *ancient* against the *latter*. And as for that at *Constance*, which first determined this case, it was neither a *General* Council, no Bishop from the *Eastern Church* being there, nor wholly approved by the *Romanists* themselves, who do some of them profess, That it did decree *against the Order of Nature, manifest Scriptures, and all Antiquity*, in other Cases, and who then would heed them in this? The like may justly be said of that at † *Basil*; save onely, that they were more kind than their Successors were, in granting upon some Conditions the Cup to the *Bohemians*.

Conc. Nic. Calcedon Ancyr, &c.

See Dr. *Featley's Grand Sacriledge*, p. 172.

Gratian. Dist. 50.

Bellarm. de concil. c. 7. *Alb. Pighius.*

† *Hujus concilii nihil est ratum & probatum, nisi quædam dispositiones circa beneficia. Concilium vero ipsum reprobatur in Conc. Lateranensi ult.* Sess. 11. Bell. de Conc. c. 7.

And thus you see the utmost strength of our *Opponents* in this point. A heap of meer *Pretences*, neither grounded on Scripture, Reason or Antiquity, but meerly supported by *feeble Arguments* and *strong Power*.

IV. I now proceed to the *Fourth* thing promised, and that is some *Application* of all this to our selves.

Use 1. See here *the Abundance of our Saviours Love and Care towards his Church.* He was not content onely to *dye* for us, but he ordained for our comfort this thankfull *Memorial* of his Death; and that on purpose to help our Faith and Comfort; and to this end appointed not onely *his flesh*, but *his blood* to be given, that if *one kind* did not sufficiently quicken and strengthen us, *the other* should be presently applyed, to perfect that good work in us. For he knew that we were dull of Apprehension, and hard to be wrought upon. To see *his Body bruised* for a poor Sinner, that may work compunction, and erect a staggering Faith; but to see again *his Blood*, wherein is a mans life, poured out; and to drink this also as an assuring Pledge that he dyed in the sinners stead, how will this fill the believing Soul with joy and comfort! The Blood of God, that will surely expiate the sin of Man. To support a poor Beggar with a piece of Bread, that's kindness; but to quench his thirst

thirſt alſo that's double Mercy. This is the Mercy of our Redeemer. He calls, *Come, eat of my Bread, and then drink of the Wine that I have mingled.* Not onely, *Eat O Friends, but,* ſaith he, *Drinke, yea drink abundantly, O beloved.* O Love without compariſon! the ſame Hands that have been lift up againſt him, the ſame Mouth that hath diſhonoured him, ſhall yet taſte that Blood, one drop whereof is of more value than Heaven and Earth. When *Alexander the Great* was married to *Statira* the Daughter of *Darius,* he had ſix thouſand Gueſts, and gave to each of them a Cup of Gold; but here are more Gueſts to be ſerved, and richer Gifts that are beſtowed. Here our dear Redeemer opens a wide Fountain for a world of ſinners; and 'tis onely *Waſh and be clean.* That bleſſed Truth is unqueſtionably here confirmed, 1 *Joh.* 1. 7. *The Blood of Jeſus Chriſt his Son cleanſeth us from all ſin.* Thus he hath choſen by *Two things*, wherein it is impoſſible to lye, to exhibit a bleeding Saviour to cure a bloody Sinner.

See *here the preſumptuous Sacriledge and Injuſtice of the Church of Rome.* To corrupt Chriſts laſt Will, and to ſerve his Family by the halves. To darken ſo clear an Inſtitution, and defeat ſo plain a Command. How will our dear Saviour reſent ſo great a wrong? He ſo free in *ſhedding* his Blood, they ſo cruel in *refuſing* it. He ſo carefull to make and ſeal his bleſſed Teſtament, they ſo ſtudious to deface it. The Maſter of the Houſe appoints ſuch proviſion for his Children, the Steward withholds the one half, and then thinks to appeaſe their Appetites with *Diſtinctions.* He that takes ſo kindly *a cup of cold water* given to a Diſciple, muſt needs take it unkindly when his own *Cup of Bleſſing* is denyed them. What Article of Religion can be ſafe in ſuch hands? what intelligent man will imbark himſelf in ſuch company, that will overturn all Scripture and Antiquity to eſtabliſh their Conceits? that will privily tax Chriſt himſelf of weakneſs, and openly wrong his whole Church at a blow. *Uſe 2.*

Indeed if this Device had had any tendency to promote *Love to God* or *true Piety*; if it had been bred and born in the Church time out of mind, their zeal and fondneſs for it might the ſooner be forgiven: But to ſtruggle ſo hard for a Tenet that can no way pretend to promote true Religion, a Tenet that was never publickly own'd in any Church for 1400 years; to deny the Wine in the Sacrament to the People, and yet *the very Veſſels* ſtill extant in ſome of their Veſtries, by which they conveyed it to the Peoples Mouths: To make ſuch a bare-fac'd Error tantamount to an *Article of Faith*, and then to Accurſe them from Chriſt, that ſhall endeavour after his Blood; what ſhall we ſay to theſe things? yea to ſay, as one of their *Cardinals* did in the Colledge, that to yield the Cup to the Laity, was to offer them *Poyſon inſtead of Phyſick*, (he had not forgotten that *wretched Monk* that poyſon'd a Chriſtian *Emperour* with the Cup at the Sacrament); to declare,

Card. S. Angel. Hiſt. Conc. Trid. p. 516. *Bernard. Henr. 6.*

clare, that to ask the Cup savoured of *Heresie*, and was in short a *mortal sin*, as some of them said in the meeting at *Trent*. These things do raise their Guilt to a very great height, and would inforce all considering men to bless themselves from such a Society.

Ric. de Vercelli Abb. Preval. Hist. Conc. Trid. p. 637.

The usual Refuge of these men, when they are baffled by the *Scriptures*, is to shelter themselves in *Tradition*, under *Councils*, or among the *Fathers*; but in *this point* the more ingenuous of them do confess that all are against them, and the more impudent make but feeble Defences from them. Divers of their own *Bishops* in the very Councel of *Trent*, argued and voted for the Truth. Several *Princes* of that Religion interceded for it, and afforded the Cup to their Subjects; and a great *Prelate*, when no good would be done therein, writes to *Cæsar*, that no relief was there to be expected, where Voices were alwayes number'd, never weighed. And is not the force of Truth very great, when it extorts an Approbation, even from the Party that opposeth it? And it is not long since a Concession of both Kinds was signified to this very Nation, on condition that we would come over to them: Thus God himself shall not have his will, unless withall they may have theirs.

Ferdinand Emperour. K. of *France*. D. of *Bavaria*. K. of *Poland*. *Dudithius* Ep. Quinq. Ep. ad *Maximil.* 2. *Cambden Eliz.* pag. 59.

And yet this is that Church which so many extoll; that is set out by such alluring Beauty, and wherein so many blind Soulds are hearded: A fit Religion for those that resolve to have none; and for such Children who will renounce a *true Father* to obey a *false and cruel Mother*.

Use 3. See here *the Folly of such among us, who deprive themselves, both of the Sacred Bread and Cup in this Ordinance.* While we are vindicating one part of this Sacrament how many are sleighting the whole?

1. *Some* do live in this sin of Omission out of *an Atheistical and profane Principle*, having no sence of Duty, or Conscience of Religion at all. *The Table of the Lord is contemptible to them.* Thus many hundreds and thousands of Adult persons never did once taste of these Gospel-dainties. Jesus Christ saith, *Take, eat, this is my Body*; *Drink ye all of this Cup of Blessing*; but they flatly refuse their Redeemers Command. Alas poor Souls! will ye never have any need of him? Can you satisfie the Justice of an offended God, by your own imperfect Righteousness? with what face can you crave Attonement by *that Blood* which you have despised? how can you be ever cleansed by that Blood which you have refused to drink? Bethink your selves, the Blood you contemn is nobler than any that runs in your veins. It is the Blood *of the Son of God*, to whom the stoutest of you must flee first or last: and if you now turn the deaf ear to his gracious calls, how justly may he refuse your cries in the day of your misery. *Be wise therefore, and kiss the Sonne, lest he be angry, and ye perish in the way.*

2. *Others*

2. *Others* neglect this Ordinance out of *a ſupine Negligence*, neither knowing their Duty, nor caring for any of theſe things. One would wonder how ſtupidly men do hear their Duty preſs'd upon them in this particular; not at all concern'd. They hold their Eſtates and Credits by another Tenure. Lands and Houſes paſs not by the Covenant of Grace, nor are ſealed with the Seals thereof. They imagine that to prepare for, and partake hereof, will ſomewhat diſ-eaſe them, and oblige them to the difficult and dreaded work of *Self-examination* and *Godly Sorrow*; and ſo they ſleep quietly in this notorious diſobedience. Hunger will haſte to Meat, Guilt to Pardon, Pain to Eaſe, Sorrow to Comfort: but where there is no ſence of the former, there is no haſte to the latter. O that ſuch would read and conſider that fearfull ſentence in a like caſe, *Numb.* 9. 13. *The man that is clean, and is not in a journey, and forbeareth to keep the Paſſe-over, even the ſame Soul ſhall be cut off from his People, becauſe he brought not the Offering of the Lord in his appointed ſeaſon, that man ſhall bear his Sin.* And never imagine that Grace or Comfort will be found in Chriſt, without the uſe of his own Ordinances, nor the *End* attain'd without the *Means*.

3. *Others* do frequently deprive themſelves of the Lords Supper *for the ſake of ſome ſin or other*, (if the truth were known) which they are loth to leave. Thus Stomachs that are clogg'd with noyſome humours, quite take away the Appetite. If anger, malice, envy, unruly paſſions; if ſenſual delights be cheriſhed within, or be not heartily hated and mortified, there will be no room for the Blood or Grace of *Jeſus Chriſt*. But (Sirs) do you mean to live, and conſequently dye in theſe ſins? what then will become of you? If you do deſire to leave and conquer them, why do you avoyd the means? will any of theſe ſins excuſe your preſent Omiſſions? not at all. One ſin can never excuſe another. What Child or Servant will be excuſed from coming to meat when you call them, by ſaying, their hands are unclean, and they have no mind to waſh them? Do you conceit that there is more real ſweetneſs in your ſins, than in Chriſt? in the filth and dregs of the world, than in the Maker and Glory of the World? *Taſte and ſee how good the Lord is*, and let the *Love of Chriſt conſtrain* you to your undoubted Duty.

4. *Others* again do deprive themſelves of the Lords Supper *out of a ſuperſtitious Fear of approaching to it*; the rather, becauſe the Scripture ſaith, that the *unworthy Receiver becomes guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord*, and withall *eateth and drinketh his own damnation*. Now a *Religious Fear* there ought to be, which ſhould not onely oblige a man to prepare himſelf for this Ordinance, but for every other. If it were a well-governed Conſcience that ruled them, it would make them as carefull of Praying and Hearing, as of Communicating; and it is moſt certain, that whoſo cannot rightly partake, can neither

rightly pray nor hear. And the *Danger* of miſcarriage is much the ſame in the one as in the other: for, to have the Word become a ſavour of death, and a mans Prayers to become ſin, differs nothing in effect from being guilty of Chriſts death, or of eating judgement (which *that word* doth properly import) that is, deſerving Gods Anger, and the effects of it to a mans ſelf.

A grievous ſin, this unworthy Receiving, (no doubt) but not unpardonable, nor ſuch as ſhould diſcourage the weakeſt child of God from ſincere Endeavours, and then a chearfull Communicating. For this Sacrament was never intended to *ſeal our Perfection*, but to *help our Imperfection*. If a Wife were lovingly invited to feaſt with her Husband, or a Child by a Father; would it not lay an imputation of an unſufferable ſeverity in the Husband or Father, or elſe of ſecret guilt, ignorance, or want of love in the Wife or Child, to refuſe to come, leſt they ſhould not be duely qualified? Even ſo in this caſe, Our *Bleſſed Redeemer* moſt lovingly calls us to his Supper; what other conſtruction can be made of our refuſal, but that either he is rigorous, or we faulty. In this caſe we cannot do better than like wife *Abigail*, 1 *Sam.* 25. 41. 42. when *David* ſent to take her to him to wife, *ſhe aroſe and bowed her ſelf on her face to the Earth, and ſaid, Behold, let thy handmaid be a ſervant, to waſh the feet of the ſervants of my Lord.* Here is a due ſence of her own unworthineſs. But in the next Verſe; *She haſted and aroſe, and went after his meſſengers, and became his Wife.* Keep up a due ſence of your own unworthineſs, but let not that hinder you from going, when he calleth you. If you periſh, yet periſh in a way of Duty. How many do we meet with, on their Deathbeds grievouſly troubled in Conſcience for their neglect herein? If you are unfit for the Lords Supper, you are unfit to dye; and how dare you live in a condition altogether unfit to die? O remember, that ſtinging Scripture, *Jam.* 2. 10. *If a man keep the whole Law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all.*

Uſe 4. Laſtly, *Let us all take care to improve this Legacy, the bleſſed Cup of Chriſts blood.* That this point lye not, like grounds long in ſuit, barren and unprofitable. While there is ſuch ſtickling for the *Sign*, let us ſtrive after the *thing ſignified.* Shall we contend ſo earneſtly for this Jewel, and then not wear it? ſhall we venture ſo hardly for this water of *Bethlehem*, and then pour it out when we have done? O no, let us ſqueeze all poſſible vertue out of this Sacred Cup; let us go up by the ſtream, to the Spring; having opened the Shell, let us feed upon the Kernel. Let us remember Chriſts bitter Death and Paſſion for us. Is thy Heart impenitent? ſteep it in the blood of this Scape-goat. Is thy Faith weak and fainting? Here's Senſe to help thy Faith. Apply the mouth of thy Faith to his wounds, and *be not faithleſs but believing.* Is thy Conſcience unquiet? bring it to be there ſprinkled with the merit

of

of his Blood. Are thy ſins as many as the ſands? his blood is as large as the Ocean, to overflow them all. When this bleſſed Cup is poured out, let thy eyes pour down a flood of tears mixed of *grief* and *joy*: To ſee ſuch a Perſon pouring out his life by thy procurement, this ſhould melt thee with grief: To ſee the Price paid by that Blood for thee, ſhould lift thee up into a trance of joy. When thou takeſt that *Cup of Salvation*, think, *What ſhall I render to the Lord for this his benefit to me? Who is this that comes with died Garments from Bozrah? how glorious is he in his Apparel!* How bitter was his Paſſion! how ſweet his compaſſion to poor ſinners! *Be ye lift up, O my everlaſting doors, and let the King of Glory come in.* Bring him into thy Soul, and there feed upon him by Faith, and let *his fruit be ſavoury to thy taſte*. Inward Communion is the Crown of an Ordinance. *It is the Cup of the New Teſtament in Chriſts blood, which was ſhed for you*; receive it with Reverence, receive it with Thankfulneſs, receive it with Application, remember his Death, *remember his Love more than Wine.*

Let us not onely *defend* the Truth, but *improve* it. If we feel no vertue or comfort in the *blood* of Chriſt, we ſhall be tempted to throw away the *Cup* as well as others. When we find no marrow in the Bone, we throw it away. He that profits by Ordinances will beſt value them; he that is refreſh'd by Wine, will never cry down the Vine; but a formal partaker will eaſily be weaned; and when the Children do but *play* with the *drink*, the Father may juſtly take away *the Cup* from them.

SERMON XXIII.

Christ crucified, the onely proper Gospel Sacrifice.

Mr Thomas Wadsworth

Hebrews X. 12.

But this man after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sate down at the right hand of God.

THE design of the Apostle in this Verse, with the Verse foregoing, is to set forth the Excellency and Perfection of our Saviours Priesthood, and his one Sacrifice, above the Levitical Priesthood, and the Plurality of Sacrifices by them offered under the Law.

This he doth by comparing them together, and by shewing wherein they agree, and wherein they differ, that so he might clearly illustrate the preheminence of the one above the other.

Their *agreement* consisted, (1) In their Office, they were both Priests: (2) In the Administration of their Office, they both did sacrifice.

Their *disagreement* consisted in these things following:

First, The Levitical Priesthood consisted of a Plurality of Persons, therefore *vers.* 11. called Priests, which, by reason of death, had many Successors. But the Evangelical Priesthood consisted but of one single Person, our Lord Jesus, called in the Text, *this man.*

Secondly, As the Levitical Priesthood consisted of a Plurality, so did their Sacrifices; for they were also very many, and therefore called (*vers.* 11.) Sacrifices. Now you must understand the Apostle there speaking not only of a Plurality as to the Number of them, but likewise as to their

their several Kindes, for they offered not onely several sorts of Beasts, as Bulls, Lambs, Goats, but of Birds also, as of Turtle-doves and young Pigeons, *&c.* But the Sacrifice which Christ offered, was but one as to the Kind, which was that Body which was prepared, *Heb.* 10. 5.

Thirdly, The Levitical Sacrifices were *oftentimes* offered, (*vers.* 11.) but the Sacrifice of Christ was but *once* offered.

Fourthly, The Levitical Sacrifices could never take away sin, *vers.* 11. but Christ by his one Sacrifice, once offered, took away sins for ever; that is, took away sins fully and everlastingly; and herein it is, that the transcendent Glory of the Gospel Sacrifice, out-shines all the Legal Sacrifices, as much as the Sun doth all the Stars in their greatest lustre: for all those Sacrifices could never take away sin, which this one hath done perfectly.

From the words thus opened, I shall gather these four Propositions.

1 Prop. *That Christ crucified is the onely divine and proper Sacrifice of the Gospel.*
2 Prop. *That the Sacrifice of Christ is but of one Kind.*
3 Prop. *That this one Sacrifice of Christ was but once offered.*
4 Prop. *That this Sacrifice of Christ once offered, was so compleatly efficacious, as that it took away sins fully and for ever.*

The first Proposition opened.

That Christ crucified is the onely divine and proper Sacrifice of the Gospel.

Here I shall explain, First, Why I say it is *divine*: Secondly, Why a *proper Sacrifice*: Thirdly, Why the *onely* proper Sacrifice of the Gospel.

First, I call it a *divine* Sacrifice, because its Institution and Appointment is of God: Let the matter of a Sacrifice be never so excellent and precious in the Eyes of Men, yet except God hath legitimated and sanctified it by his Appointment, it would prove but an Abomination in the Eyes of God. As suppose one should offer up the Fruit of his Body for the sin of his Soul, which is a kind of Sacrifice, than the which there is nothing a man can more highly value, and more hardly part with, which yet *Abraham* was ready to have done in his *Isaac* at Gods Command, whereby he did wonderfully signalize his Faith, and obtained favour with God. But when apostatized *Israel* essayed to give a like testimony of Honour to a mistaken Deity, the Lord by his Prophet *Jeremiah* doth not onely charge them with Idolatry, but likewise with the Kind of Sacrifice that they offered, which was of their Sons and Daughters, of which he saith, *which I commanded them not, neither came it into my mind, that they should do this abomination.* So that every Sacrifice that hath not the stamp of Divine Authority to legitimate it, is not to be accounted of as

as Divine, or of any worth or acceptance with God. But now I say, that this Sacrifice of Christ crucified, is of Divine appointment, and so a Divine Sacrifice: This is clearly asserted by the Apostle, *Heb.* 10. 5, 6, 7. *Psal.* 40. 6. *Wherefore, when he cometh into the World, he saith, Sacrifice and Offering thou wouldest not, but a Body hast thou prepared me.* v. 6. *In Burnt-offerings and Sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure: Then said I, Lo, I come, (in the Volume of the Book it is written of me) to do thy will, O God.* Mark that; Christ took up a Body, in order to be sacrificed, instead of all Legal Sacrifices, and this in complyance to the Will of God, which he farther explaineth *vers.* 10. *By which Will we are sanctified, through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.* The summe of what the Apostle saith is this, That God would be satisfied with no Sacrifice but that of his Son, and that with this Sacrifice he would be pleased, and therein would accept of all that should believe. The Conclusion is this, That because Christ was crucified at the appointment of God, (as I have proved) therefore I call Christ crucified a *Divine Sacrifice*.

Secondly, I say further, that Christ crucified, is not onely a *divine* but likewise a *proper* Sacrifice, and that for this Reason: Because the most essential Properties of the most perfect Sacrifices under the Law, which were those that were Expiatory, I say the Properties of such kind of Sacrifices agree to this of Christ crucified.

There are Four Properties of an Expiatory Sacrifice, all of which, I shall shew you, do agree with this of our Christ crucified.

1. The first Property of such a Sacrifice is, that it be of some *living Creature* slain and its blood shed, and offered up unto God; this is so evident to any that hath but any knowledge in the Laws of God concerning the Nature of his Sacrifices that it will seem a needless matter to adde any thing for the illustration or proof thereof. Certain it is, that the Holy Scriptures, both in the Hebrew and in the Greek, use such words for a Sacrifice as do include a slaughter in them; the one being זֶבַח the other θυσία: and the Apostle throughout this Epistle, speaking of Sacrifices, whether they were of Bulls, Goats, or Lambs, he all along maketh mention of their Blood shed, which cannot be but with their slaughter: so that there is nothing more evident, than that slaying and shedding of blood is the Property of an Expiatory Sacrifice. Now it is as clear, that our Christ crucified had this property, for he was nailed Hands and feet to the Cross, and through those wounds bled to death; besides, when dead, the remainder of his Blood issued from his side, pierced with a Souldiers Spear: this blood thus shed, the Apostle *Peter* calls *precious blood*, and withall calls it *the blood of a Lamb without blemish*, therein alluding to the sacrificed Lamb under the Law; of which shadow Christ the Lamb of God sacrificed under the Gospel is the substance. From what hath been said, it is evident that this first property of an Expiatory Sacrifice, doth fully comport with the death of Christ.

2. The

2. The second property of a Sacrifice, is that it was offered to God for the *Expiation of Sin*: This was the End of the *Levitical* expiatory Sacrifices, as the Apostle tells us, *Hebr.* 9. 7. when he saith, *Into the second Tabernacle went the High-priest alone, once a year, not without blood, which he offered for himself and Errors of the People*; which is as much as if he had said, That the blood of those Beasts he had sacrificed, he took with him into the Tabernacle, and there offered it to God for his own and the peoples sins. Now though he tells us, *Heb.* 10. 4. that *it is not possible for the blood of Bulls and Goats to take away sin*: which seems at first sight very harsh, that those Sacrifices that were appointed to be offered for sin, and yet that they could not, when offered, possibly take sin away. But let the Apostle answer for himself, as he is best able, which he doth *Heb.* 9. 9. compared with the 13th *vers.* In the ninth verse, he tells you in what sence they could not take away sin: *There were offered* (saith he) *gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the Conscience.* The meaning of which words I shall rather give you in the Paraphrase of Learned Dr. *Hammond*, than in my own; which are brief, full and plain. "Thereby, (*saith he*) is meant, That all these Legal Performances will "not be able to give any man confidence to pray unto God, to bring "him to Heaven, or to obtain for him the pardon of any wilfull or pre-"sumptuous sin in the sight of God, or free him from any sin that hath "wasted his Conscience, or give him grace to purge himself from such "sin. In all these respects those Legal Sacrifices could not possibly take away sin. But you will say, In what sence did they take away sin? The Apostle will tell you, *vers.* 13. *If the blood of Bulls and Goats sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh.* He had told you before, that they could not make perfect as pertaining to the Conscience; but now he saith, as to the *flesh*, those Sacrifices did purifie, and so in a sort did take away sin. By *flesh* is here meant, the Outward man considered in his External priviledges as to his Judaical Church-state, of which Priviledges this is the summe, *viz.* Communion with that Church in External Ordinances of Worship, from which upon every Ceremonial Uncleanness the *Jew* was excluded, but upon offering up of a Sacrifice for his cleansing, his fault was pass'd by, and he was re-admitted to his former Communion; and these were the Errors of the Priests and the People, from which upon their offering of Sacrifices they were cleared. And now you see the Objection removed, and yet the Property of an Expiatory Sacrifice cleared; and that is, that it was offered for the taking away of sin. And now let us apply this Property of a Sacrifice to Christ crucified, and see whether it doth not thereto agree.

I say therefore, that answerably Christ was as a Sacrifice crucified, and therein offered up to God for the Expiation of sin. This is fully asserted by the Apostle, *Heb.* 9. 14. *How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the Eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God,*

God, purge your Conscience from dead works, to serve the living God: That is, if the Sacrifices of the Law so far availed as to the purifying of the flesh, the Sacrifice of Christ shall much more avail to purifie the Conscience; that is, so perfectly to settle and quiet the Conscience from the fears of the wrath of God for sins committed (which are the dead works the Apostle speaketh of) to this end among the rest, that the sinner thus quieted, might *serve the living God*, not slavishly, for fear of Wrath, but from Love, as becometh a gracious Child, whom his merciful Father hath so freely pardoned through the Sacrifice of his own Son. The consideration of this Verse, with that of the Text I am speaking from, is abundantly sufficient to clear up the second Property of an Expiatory Sacrifice to belong to Christ crucified, which is this, That every such Sacrifice was offered for the taking away of sin.

3. A Third property of an Expiatory Sacrifice is, that it was to be offered up by a *Priest* ordained of God to that end. To this very *end* (saith the Apostle *Heb.* 8.3.) was the High-priest (under the Law) ordained, *to offer gifts and sacrifices*. So that hence it is evident, that no Sacrifice was to be offered but by a Priest thus ordained: And was it not for *Sauls* presumption in this Kind, that lost him his Kingdom, 1 *Sam.* 13.9. 13, 14.

Well then, if every Expiatory Sacrifice must have a Priest to offer it, so had our Christ crucified; for it was a Sacrifice offered up to God by himself our onely High-priest, being appointed to that Office by God. That Christ was appointed by God to this Office, is manifest from *Psal.* 110.4. *The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, thou art a Priest for ever after the Order of Melchizedek*. That this is meant of Christ's being by God designed to this Office, is clear from *Heb.* 7.17. where the Apostle applyes this Prophesie to Jesus Christ. But farther, as from what hath been said, it doth appear, that Christ is a Priest ordained of God, so likewise it doth further appear, that this our High-Priest was he that did offer up himself as a Sacrifice to God, if you consider *John* 6. 51. *The Bread* (saith Christ) *that I will give, is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world*. Now this flesh was given in his Death, which was given by himself when he voluntarily offered it up unto God in that most holy Sacrifice. So in *Heb.* 7. 27. it is said, *Christ offered up himself*; Christ was not onely the Sacrifice, but the Sacrificer. So *Heb.* 9. 26 *Now once in the end of the World, hath he appeared to put away Sin by the Sacrifice of himself*. Nothing more plain, than that Christ in these places is to be understood both as Priest and Sacrifice.

But it may be objected, How can Christ be said to sacrifice himself, whenas he did not kill himself, or shed his own blood; for he was apprehended by Order from the High-priest, led away as a Prisoner, arraigned and condemned unjustly, and in a violent cruel manner crucified by his malicious Enemies: He did not slay himself, but was slain by the *Jews*.

I answer,

I answer, Though he did not slay himself, (for that had been Self-murder, which had been a sin that had not become this spotless Lamb; but) yet this is evident, that he did offer up himself to be slayn by them, in complyance with the Councel of his Father, and in complyance with all the Prophecies of the Old Testament, that foretold, he must be cut off for the People. *O fools* (saith Christ to his doubting Disciples,) *and slow of heart, to believe all that the Prophets have spoken: Ought not Christ to have suffered these things? Ought he not?* That is, was it not his Duty, in complyance with his Fathers will, who had designed him thereto, and foretold this his designation by his Prophets. But from the History of the Manner of his Death, it is very clear, that Christ did very readily offer up himself as a *Victim* to be slain for the sins of his people. For first, he knew when he went his last Journey to *Jerusalem*, that his hour was come, and yet he went up, *John* 12. 23. Then he knew also, that *Judas* at that time designed to betray him, but he was so far from seeking to prevent it, that he rather seems to hasten it, when he sayes to *Judas*, *What thou doest, doe quickly.* Then again, when his Enemies came to apprehend him, he sought not to escape them, but going forth, *Joh.* 18. 4. saith, *If ye seek Jesus of Nazareth, I am he.* And when he was in their hands, he could, (as he tells them) but *pray to his Father*, and of him obtain an Army of *Angels* to his rescue, but would not; for having received a Body for to sacrifice, and the hour of offering it up being come, he most willingly surrendred himself to his Enemies for the slaughter: And this is agreeable to what he sayes, *Joh.* 10. 15. 18. *I lay down my life for the sheep, no man taketh it from me*; that is, not against my will, but I lay it down of my self. And thus it became our High-priest to doe, wh had the Sacrifice of himself to offer by himself. And thus I have shewn, how the Third Property of an Expiatory Sacrifice belongs to Christ crucified, It was to be offered by a Priest ordained by God, and such an ordained Priest was Christ, who at Gods appointment offered up himself.

4. The Fourth Property of an Expiatory Sacrifice regularly offered, is, that it was of a *sweet savour unto God*; that is, it was highly pleasing, and graciously accepted of by him. This is evident from what God himself hath said, concerning such Sacrifices, *Levit.* 1. 9. *The Priest shall burn all on the Altar, to be a Burnt-offering of a sweet savour unto the Lord.* This is repeated again and again, *vers.* 13. 17. Now that this Sacrifice of Christ crucified might in no case fall short of those Legal Sacrifices, the Apostle, *Ephes.* 5. 2. doth apply the very same Property to this Sacrifice of Christ, in these words, *Walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us, an Offering, and a Sacrifice to God, for a sweet-smelling savour.* And certainly, there was never any thing in this World acted to a greater Satisfaction to the most High God, than this of Christs dying for sinners, of which God hath given this testimony, that he hath so highly exalted him, as a Reward of these

his Sufferings, according to the Apostle, *Philip.* 2. 8, 9. *Being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross: wherefore God hath highly exalted him, and given him a Name which is above every Name, that at the Name of Jesus every knee should bow*, &c. And what signifies this Honour God hath heaped on him for his Sufferings, but that this his suffering death was highly pleasing, and of a sweet savour to him. Thus have I in Four things shewn you how evident it is, that Christ crucified is a proper Expiatory Sacrifice, as having all the essentially necessary Properties of such a Sacrifice; which was the second point in the first Proposition to be cleared.

There is one thing more in the first Proposition to be cleared up and proved, which is, *That Christ crucified is the Onely proper Gospel Sacrifice.*

I say, it is the *onely proper Sacrifice* of the Gospel,

First, That I might exclude all Judaical Sacrifices, which till Christ, were of God, both commanded and accepted, but since his coming, and since he hath offered up himself, all those Sacrifices are now abolished, God taking no longer any pleasure therein, *Hebr.* 10. 6. *In Burnt-offerings and Sacrifices for sin thou hadst no pleasure: Then said I*, (that is Christ) *I come to do thy Will, O God*; that is, to sacrifice my self: In this latter he hath pleasure, but not in the former, which are therefore taken away.

Secondly, I call Christ crucified the *onely proper Sacrifice*, to exclude the *Romish Masse*, which those pretended Catholicks would fain have us believe to be a *proper* Sacrifice, and the very same with that of Christ crucified, but how groundlesly I shall shew afterward.

Thirdly, I call it the *onely proper Sacrifice*, to distinguish it from several other *improper Sacrifices* under the Gospel, as that of doing good and communicating, of which the Apostle saith, *With such Sacrifices God is well-pleased, Heb.* 13. 16. Such is that of devoting ones body to the Service of God, called *Rom.* 12. 1. *a living Sacrifice*; so is that of offering Praise, *Hebr.* 13. 15. These I acknowledge have the name of Sacrifices under the Gospel, but there is no man doubteth, that they are improperly and onely by way of Allusion so called: For as a Sacrifice is a Holy thing offered up to the Lord, so is doing Good, devoting ones self to Gods Service, and offering Praise to God, holy things also, and so metaphorically called Sacrifices; but in these Performances, there is no slaying, or shedding of Blood, or making Attonement for sin, which were necessary to speak them proper Sacrifices. Thus much shall suffice for the clearing up of the third and last part of the first Proposition, which now I conceive I have sufficiently proved, *That Christ crucified, is the onely divine and proper Sacrifice of the Gospel.*

The

The Second Proposition.

That this Sacrifice is but of one kind.

Such is part of the meaning of the Apostle in the Text, when he saith, *But this man when he had offered one Sacrifice*; he means not one only in *number*, but as to the *kind*; of this latter I shall now speak.

It is well known that the Sacrifices of the Law were of divers kinds of Beasts, as Bulls, Goats, Lambs; and of Birds, as Turtle-doves and young Pidgeons. But the Sacrifice of the Gospel is but of one kind, which is the Blood of Jesus, which through the Eternal Spirit was offered up to God.

But it may be asked, Why the Sacrifices of the Law were of divers sorts, since they were to shadow forth the Gospel Sacrifice, which was to be but of one sort or kind?

I answer, It might be for this Reason: Because that the Gospel Sacrifice was to be of that absolute Perfection, both as to its Matter as well as Ends, that no one kind of Legal Sacrifice could fully represent; and therefore it was, that several sorts of Creatures that had very different qualities, were elected and appointed by God, to typifie out by parts, what was summarily comprehended in that one Sacrifice of Christ. As when God appointed the Bull for the Sacrifice, since that Creature hath an excellency of strength superiour to any other Beast of the Field, it might be to shadow forth the very great ability of our Lord Jesus for this undertaking. Then again, there was choyce made of another sort of Creature, which had not that eminency of Strength as the Bull, but was superiour in Meekness and Innocency; such was the Lamb, to set forth that remarkable Meekness and Innocency of our Saviour in the sacrificing of himself, of whom the Prophet saith, *He was led like a Lamb, to the slaughter, and as a Sheep before the shearers was he dumb, he opened not his mouth.* So also was the Goat called out for a Sacrifice, not so much to signifie any Quality of Christs own Person, but rather the Nature and Qualities of those Persons in whose stead he dyed, which were Sinners; for as the Goat is noted to be a Beast of a very lustfull nature, and of as ill a savour, such also are sinners, full of strong and loathsome lusts, of a very ill savour in the Nostrils of the Holy God. Now Christ being to represent the Persons of such in whose stead he dyed, was therefore typified forth by this Sacrifice of a Goat. To adde to these, there was also sacrificed Turtle-doves and young Pidgeons; now this is observable of this sort of Birds, that there are no Birds superiour to them in Love and Faithfulness to their Mates; by which might be shadowed forth the incomparable Love and Faithfulness of Jesus Christ to his Church, whom he loved, and bought with his own Blood: Never was Turtle-dove so tender of, and faithfull to his Mate, as Christ hath been and is to his Church. So that all the qualities of those several sorts of

Legal Sacrifices meeting in our one Sacrifice of Christ, they were fit in conjunction to be his Type, and did more compleatly display the Nature of his Sacrifice, than if but any one of them had been appointed for that use. And this I conceive is the Reason why the Sacrifices of the Law were of divers sorts, and yet they were all but the Type of one single Sacrifice of the Gospel. Thus have I briefly illustrated the second Propositon.

The Third Propositon.

That this one Sacrifice of Christ was but once offered.

This is clear to them that consult these following Scriptures: *Rom.* 6. 10. *He dyed unto sin once.* Hebr. 7. 27. *He needeth not to offer up sacrifices, first for his own sins, and then for the Peoples; but this he did once, when he offered up himself.* Heb. 9. 26. *But now once in the end of the world hath he appeared, to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.* Vers. 28. *So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many.* Heb. 10. 10. *By the which will we are sanctified, through the offering of the Body of Christ, once for all.* 1 Pet. 3. 18. *For Christ hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust.* Now certainly, the Holy Ghost would never have layd such an Emphasis upon the singularity or Oneness of Christs Sacrifice, as apparently he doth in those Scriptures now named, were it not for very good and very great Reason, and what is that but to signifie, that this one Sacrifice, once offered, was every way compleat, and sufficient for the full obtaining of all the Ends of a Sacrifice.

That this Sacrifice once offered, was sufficient, I prove these three wayes.

First, Because it was as often as God required. *This commandment* (saith our Lord) *have I received of my Father, that I should lay down my life for my sheep, and take it again,* Joh. 10. 15, 18. Hence it is certain, that his Father would have him lay it down once, and then to take it again: But was it his intent he should take it again to lay it down again? not so; for then, since he hath not yet come to die again, it would be our duty to expect him a second time to die for us; but this we expect not, indeed he will come a second time, but (as the Apostle saith) *without sin*; that is, not to bear again the punishment of sin, as he did in his once dying: but then he will come *to salvation*; that is, to perfect that salvation to his Saints, for whom he purchased it by his once dying. But our Saviour puts us out of doubt in this particular, inasmuch as he hath told us, he will die no more, *Rev.* 1. 18. *I was dead, but I am now he that liveth, and behold I live for evermore*; which he could not have said, but that he knows, that his Father requires no more deaths at his hand than what he eath already payd.

Secondly, This once was sufficient, because it was as much as the Law required.

required. The Law was to *Adam*, That *if thou eatest of the forbidden Tree, thou shalt die the death threatned*, was but once to be executed; and therefore Christ being the sinners Surety, could not be bound to pay more than the sinners debt, this is clearly and fully asserted by the Apostle, *Heb.* 9. 27. As *it is appointed* (that is, by the Law) *unto men, once to die, and after this to judgement*; so Christ was once offered to *bear the sins of many*; that is, Christ was once sacrificed to take off that Curse of once dying, that by the Law was threatned to the sinner. The Law being thus compleatly satisfied by Christs thus once dying, it was a very needless matter upon this account for Christ to die a second time.

Thirdly, Christs dying once was sufficient, because it was as much as the *Sinner needed*.

This will be best understood, if we take an Account of the sinners wants.

(1) It is evident, that by sin the Holy God was provoked to Anger, and therefore the sinner wanted a Reconciliation, which this one Sacrifice once offered hath procured, *Ephes.* 2. 16. *Christ hath reconciled both* (that is, Jew and Gentile) *unto God in one body, by the Cross*; that is, he (by his once offering up himself in Sacrifice to God) hath made the believing sinners peace with God, whether he be *Jew* or *Gentile*.

(2) Again, the sinner hath forfeited his Life to the Justice of God, by sin; answerably, Christ by his once dying hath discharged the Law of Death, and procured for the Believer a glorious Resurrection to an Eternal Life.

(3) Again, sin had blinded and hardned the sinners Mind and Conscience, as to the things of God, so that he became so utterly unable to help himself, that he neither knew the Law of God, or if he had known it, he was not able to submit himself to that Law, being at enmity thereto. But Christ by his one Sacrifice once offered, procured a new, gracious and everlasting Covenant, one of the principal Promises whereof is, That God will put his Laws in their Minds, and write them in their Hearts, *Heb.* 8. 9. that is, he will so enlighten their minds, and sanctifie their hearts, as that they shall not onely know, but readily obey him in whatever he commandeth: Now this Covenant and this Promise, is the Purchase of this one Sacrifice once offered.

(4) Lastly, Sin had got into the sinners Conscience, and so fired it with the flashes of Guilt, and allarum'd it with the Threatnings of the Law, and so affrighted it with the wrath of God, that the poor sinner could find no ease or quiet: But this once offered Sacrifice hath so purged the Conscience from dead works, (*Heb.* 9. 14.) that the Soul finds it self at ease, that it can serve the Lord without distraction: For being fully perswaded (that sin being pardoned, and God at peace through this blood) that it shall never fall under Condemnation, it hears no more of the boysterous storms of the Law and Conscience, but enjoyes a great Calm all its dayes.

Now

Now if Christs once offered Sacrifice hath both satisfied God, answered the Law, and every way supplyed the sinners lacks, it cannot be imagined, what room should be left for a repetition of the same Sacrifice. And therefore, being we are assured, that Christ was to do nothing impertinent and in vain, we are upon the same ground assured, *That he was to be sacrificed but once*; which is the third Proposition.

The Fourth Proposition.

That this Sacrifice of Christ once offered, was so perfectly efficacious, as to take away sins fully and for ever.

This Proposition is clearly contained in the Text: For when it is said, *This man after he had offered one Sacrifice for sins for ever*, the words [*for ever*] are certainly to be referred to the Efficacy of this one Sacrifice once offered; for it there stands opposed to the inefficacy of the Legal Sacrifices, of which he had said *vers.* 11. *they can never take away sin*; the meaning is, That what all the sorts of Sacrifices often offered under the Law, could never doe, that this one Sacrifice of Christ once offered under the Gospel, hath done perfectly to the Believer; that is, hath not left one sin unpardoned, but hath taken away every sin everlastingly.

1. I say first, it was so efficacious as to take away all sins to the true Believer, fully and compleatly; nor can the Apostle, *Rom.* 8. 33, 34. mean any thing less, when he saith, *Who shall lay any thing to the charge of Gods Elect? It is God that justifieth, who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that dyed.* Certainly, if there is no Judge to be found in Heaven or Earth that can justly condemn the Believer, then there is no Sin that the Believer stands guilty of, but all must be pardoned: For was there but one sin unpardoned, there would be found Judges enow to condemn him. But whence is it that the Believer becomes so secure? The Apostle tells you the Reason, and that is, *Christ hath dyed.* Again, this may farther be confirmed from *Acts* 13. 38, 39. *Be it known unto you therefore, Brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins, and by him all that believe, are justified from all things* (that is all sins) *from which ye could not be justified by the Law of Moses:* The meaning is, That through the Death of Christ is preached the Remission of all sins, from which ye could not be freed by all the Sacrifices of the Law of *Moses*; what those Sacrifices could not doe, that the one Sacrifice of Christ once offered, hath done fully.

And not onely so, for as his one Sacrifice once offered, took away or procured the pardon of all sins to the Believer, so it took them away *for ever.* This it hath done by procuring the second Covenant, which hath this Promise, *Heb.* 8. 12. *I will be mercifull to their unrighteousnesse, and their sins and iniquities I will remember no more:* To remember them no more, is as much as if it had been said, They shall be everlastingly

lastingly forgiven, so that not one of them shall ever rise up to the Condemnation of the Believer. The Conclusion is this, That if all Sins are eternally pardoned to the Believer, upon the Merit of this one Sacrifice once offered, then is this Sacrifice a most compleat and efficacious Sacrifice, nor doth the Believer stand in need of any other Sacrifice, no nor of the repetition of this very same Sacrifice, which is the fourth Proposition, and is now (I conceive) fully proved.

Having thus cleerly and briefly confirmed the *Protestant Doctrine* concerning that great Article of the proper Gospel Expiatory Sacrifice, which doth highly concern every Sinner to understand, without which it is impossible for him to know how or which way he may attain to the Remission of his Sins, and the Salvation of his Soul: I come now at length to take a view of the *Romish* Doctrine, concerning their vain, impertinent, blasphemous and idolatrous Sacrifice of the *Mass*. I call it *vain* and *impertinent*, because by the one Sacrifice of Christ once offered on the Cross, God is sufficiently satisfied, and the Sinner sufficiently secured: To what end then serves their pretended Sacrifice of the Mass? I call it *blasphemous*, because so derogatory to the Sacrifice of Christ, as if Christs Death on the Cross was not sufficient without the Auxiliary of the Mass to make an Attonement for sin, and save the sinner. I call it *Idolatrous*, because they have made it a meer Idol, not onely worshipping and adoring Sacramental Bread and Wine as their true Saviour, but in trusting therein for salvation as in Christ himself, than the which there was never any thing invented by the Devil himself, that was more Idolatrous.

But before I shall give you my Arguments against this Popish Doctrine of the Mass's being a proper Sacrifice, since I write principally for the information and establishment of our weaker Brethren, I shall first tell you what is meant by the *Mass*, the Doctrine whereof those cruel bloody Papists have formerly endeavoured to impose on the Faith of your Fore-fathers, with Racks, Prisons, Iron Fetters, cruel Mockings, Faggots and Fire, and which assuredly they would by the same methods of savageness, instead of Arguments, endeavour to impose on you, if ever the Lord should be pleased to give you up into their hands for tryal, which the good Lord in mercy prevent.

Know then, that what we Protestants call (according to Scripture) the Lords Supper, that the Papists (according to the Tradition of men) call the Mass.

But this is not all, for we differ from them not onely in the Name, but in the Explication of the Nature of the thing it self. as thus:

We Protestants hold, that in the Lords Supper after Consecration, there remains real Bread, and real Wine. But the Papists believe, that after the Consecration, or after the Priest hath pronounced these words, *This is my Body*, and *This is the New Testament in my Blood, &c.* that the Bread and Wine are by a certain Miracle transubstantiated into the very same flesh and blood wherein Christ suffered on the Cross.

Again,

Again, we Protestants believe, that this Sacramental Supper of Bread and Wine, is a figure of the real Sacrifice of Christ crucified, appointed by Christ for the remembrance thereof, and so we doubt not to call it a figurative Metaphorical Sacrifice. But this will not satisfie the Papists, for they believe, that this Bread and Wine is so changed into the very same Body of Christ which was nailed to the Cross, and into that very Blood that he there shed, and that consequently it is a real proper and true Expiatory Sacrifice for our sins, as that of Christ crucified on the Cross; which is certainly the meaning of the Council of *Trent*, in those words of the Decree concerning this point. Speaking of the Mass, say they, *Cujus Oblatione Deum esse placatum, & pœnitentiæ donum concedere, & peccata omnia demittere:* i. e. That upon the offering of the Mass, God is pacified, and Repentance, and Remission of sins given. And what can be said more of the Vertue and Efficacy of Christ himself crucified?

In the next place, we Protestants believe, that in the receiving this Supper, as with our Bodies we eat real Bread, and drink real Wine, so our Souls by Faith do feed upon the real Body and Blood of Christ, that was once offered in Sacrifice for the reconciling us to God, for the Remission of sins, and the Salvation of our Souls, which benefits we by Faith apply to our selves, for which we bless and praise God, who hath graciously bestowed them on us, for the merits sake of that one Sacrifice of Christ once offered. But the Papists believe, that not onely their Souls by Faith, but likewise the mouths of their Bodies, do eat and drink in the Mass, the very Body and Blood of Christ, as really as if they had eat him off from the Cross, or drunk in his Blood as it issued out of his pierced hands, feet and side. In a word, the Papists have turned the Lords Supper into an abominable Idol, and take the Bread and Wine to be the true and real Redeemer of the World, and do as devoutly worship and adore it, as we do the God-man Jesus now at the right hand of the Majesty on high; which is Idolatry with a witness.

Having now shewed you what the *Romish* Mass is, I now come to lay down those Arguments which I shall draw from the precedent discourse, by which I will prove, that this Mass is no proper Gospel Expiatory Sacrifice, which the *Romish* Church believes it to be.

The general Argument is this:

If the one Sacrifice of Christ crucified, once offered on the Cross, is the onely divine and proper Sacrifice of the Gospel, as I have proved, *then the Mass is no divine proper Gospel Sacrifice.*

The Reason of the consequence is this, because the Mass is another thing, of a very different nature from that of Christ crucified; and therefore being not the very same thing, it cannot be the very same Sacrifice; and if it be not the very same, it cannot be a *proper Gospel Sacrifice*, because that onely (as I have proved) is the onely proper Gospel Sacrifice. This is so evident, that I see no possibility of evading the force of its Reason.

That

That then which remains to be proved, is this, *That the Mass is not the very same thing, and of the same nature with that of Christ crucified, and therefore cannot be the same Sacrifice.*

In this very point lies the very heart and life of the Controversie betwixt us and them, as is evident from the words of the Decree of the *Trent*-Council, which are these: *Idem ille Christus in hoc Missæ Sacrificio incruentè immolatur, qui in arâ crucis cruentè seipsum obtulit, unâ eadémque existente hostia, eo qui nunc Sacerdotum ministerio offert, & qui seipsum tunc in cruce obtulit, sola offerendi diversa.* The meaning whereof in short is this: That there is no real difference betwixt the Sacrifice of Christ on the Cross, and Christ in the Mass; it is the very same in both, onely differing in the Reason of Offering; for in the Cross he offered himself immediately, in the Mass he offers himself by the Ministry of his under-Priests. *Lib.6.* pa. 455: *Histor. Concil.*

So then, since the whole controversie lies on this one point, all my Arguments shall be level'd against this their strong hold.

This then I shall prove, That the Mass is not properly the very self-same Sacrifice with that of Christ crucified on the Cross.

1 *Arg.* The Mass cannot be the same Sacrifice with that of Christ on the Cross, because Christ crucified was a Sacrifice of Gods appointment, and so Divine, which I proved in the first Proposition; but so is not the Mass, for God never appointed it for a Sacrifice, therefore it cannot be the very same: for were it the very same sacrifice, and yet never appointed of God to be a sacrifice, as Christ crucified was, then one and the same Sacrifice might be appointed of God, and yet not appointed of God, which is a contradiction. That the Mass, which we call the Lords Supper, was appointed by the Lord Jesus, for the remembrance of that one Sacrifice once offered on the Cross, I deny not. Nor do I deny, that the Mass is a proper Sacrifice by the Authority of Humane Tradition; a like Authority to that of the *Pharisees*, by which they would not eat except they washed, or by which they thought it lawfull to be cruel to their Parents, in not relieving their wants, under pretext of their *Corban*: But I deny it to be a Sacrifice by any Authority from God, or his Son Jesus: This was ingenuously confessed by *Ataides Lusitanus* one of the *Trent*-Council, who yet was stout enough in his belief of its being a Sacrifice by Apostolical Tradition, as he sayes, *Pro certo concludendum, Doctrinam eam Apostolicam esse Traditionem*; this I mention to shew he was a Papist. "But (saith he) whoever goes about "to prove it such from Scripture, doth but as it were goe about to build "Castles in the Aire. His words are, *Verum autem hoc solidum Argumentum debilitari ab his, qui aëria sibi struunt, è sacra Scriptura id elicere frustrà conantibus, quod nusquam ibi reperitur, atque adversariis veritatis calumnia violandæ ansam præbentibus, dum rident eos arenâ laxâ ac instabili ædificare.* So far he. I know hereby he disgusted the Council, but that's nothing to me, so long as he speaks words of sober- *Lib.6.* pa.444. *Hist. Concili. Trident.*

 ness,

nesse, I value him not a jot the lesse, nor his testimony. But have they any Scripture wherein the Mass is directly called a Sacrifice? No; they pretend not thereto: but they say there are many places of Scripture from whence it may be directly gathered, the examination whereof I shall referre to the conclusion, for it were too long a businesse to speak to them all in this place. At present I conclude, that if they have no ground from Scripture to conclude it a Sacrifice, that then they have no ground to believe it such by Divine Authority; but such ground we have to believe that of Christ crucified to be a Sacrifice, therefore they are not the very same Sacrifice; at least they have no ground to believe so: But as I said, for the proof of its having no Divine Authority for its being a Sacrifice, I referre to the close.

2 *Arg.* The Mass cannot be the same Sacrifice with that of Christ crucified at *Jerusalem*, because Christ there crucified was a proper Sacrifice, as I have proved in the first Proposition; but the Mass cannot be a proper sacrifice, therefore it is not the same, and so no Gospel sacrifice; the reason of the consequence is this, that if the Mass is an improper sacrifice, and Christ crucified a proper sacrifice, and yet the Mass and Christ crucified were one and the same sacrifice, then the one and the same sacrifice of the Gospel would be both a proper and an improper sacrifice, which is a contradiction. That the Mass (if it be a Sacrifice) is not a proper sacrifice, I prove by these four following Arguments.

(*Arg.* 1.) A proper Expiatory Sacrifice hath this property, it consists of some living creature slain, and its blood shed and offered up unto God. But the Mass consists of no living creature slain, and its blood shed and offered up to God. The former I have proved in the first Proposition: The latter I prove from the Papists own confession. For they say not, that Christ is slain, and his blood shed in the Mass: and therefore in the forequoted Article of the Council of *Trent*, they say, that in the Mass, *Christus incruentè immolatur*, that is, they acknowledge the Mass is a sacrifice without blood. Which is absurd in the nature of the thing; for we may as well conceive of a Fire without heat, as a sacrifice without blood, for as heat is of the Essence of fire, so is blood of an Expiatory Sacrifice: Beside, it is flatly contradictory to that saying of the Apostle, applyed by him both to the Expiatory sacrifices of the Law, and that also of the Gospel; of both which he saith, *Without shedding of blood there is no remission*, Heb. 9. 22. Yea, say the Papists, but there is, in contradiction to the Apostle, for the Mass is a sacrifice Expiatory of sin; and yet therein there is no Remission. This is the first.

(*Arg.* 2.) The Mass can be no proper Expiatory sacrifice, because it wants the second Property of such a sacrifice, which is this, that every such sacrifice takes away sin, and if it be a proper Gospel sacrifice, it takes away sin by vertue of its merit. But the Mass is no such sacrifice that takes away sin: The former I have proved in the first Proposition. The latter I thus prove: The Mass is not a Gospel sacrifice expiatory

of

of sin, because, if Christ hath by his one sacrifice, once offered, taken away sin fully and everlastingly (as I have proved;) then is there no sin remaining for the Mass to expiate. Sin as to the Curse is the sinners Debt, Christ hath payd that debt, in his being once offered, to the utmost farthing; for thereby, as I have proved, God was satisfied, the Law discharged, and the sinner perfectly relieved: so then, if there is no sin left for the Mass to expiate, it's impossible that God (that appoints nothing in vain) should appoint the Mass as a sacrifice to no purpose. And therefore I say, it is no proper sacrifice.

(*Arg.* 3.) The Mass can be no proper Gospel sacrifice, because it hath no Priest assigned of God to offer it. The reason of this consequence is, because as I have proved in the first Proposition, that both the Legal and also the Evangelical sacrifice was by Gods special appointment to be offered by a Priest and none else. But the Mass hath no Divinely appointed Priest to offer it as a sacrifice; which is thus proved. If the Mass hath any Priest appointed of God to offer it as a proper sacrifice, this Priest must either be the High-priest, which is onely Jesus Christ, or some other inferiour Priests, delegated by Jesus Christ as his substitutes: But the Lord Jesus doth not offer the Mass in sacrifice here on Earth, in his own person, for he is in Heaven, and the Mass is offered on Earth; nor indeed do the Papists say so much; for their belief is, that Christ offers himself now in the Mass, *Sacerdotum Ministerio*, by the delegation of his Priests on Earth. But this cannot be true, for these Reasons.

First, Because there is not so much as the name of Priest throughout the New Testament, given to any such subordinate Officer of Christs Church. We read indeed of Apostles, Evangelists, Pastors, Teachers, Elders, Presbyters, but not of Priests: and this indeed the Jesuite *Lorinus* confesseth, in *Acts* 14. 22. *de Sacerdote. Ab hoc abstinet Novum Testamentum, ut magis proprio antiqui Legis Sacrificii, concedo.* i. e. I grant, the New Testament abstains from the word Priest, as more proper to the ancient Sacrifice of the Law. Indeed the Apostle *Peter* calls the body of the Church a *holy Priesthood, to offer up spiritual Sacrifices*, as prayers and prayses, and themselves unto God, which are all improper Sacrifices, and so is their Priesthood improper also; but of any proper inferiour Priest, we read not so much as of the Name (as I said) in the New Testament.

Secondly, Christ hath appointed no such inferiour Priest to offer him up as a proper Sacrifice in the Mass, because there is no such thing given in Commission by Jesus Christ to any Officers on Earth, to offer up a proper Sacrifice. Indeed we read, Christ sent them to teach and baptize, to feed the flock, and to rule and govern them in the Lord, *&c.* but not a word of offering up any proper sacrifice. Some indeed of the Papists urge, *Hoc facite, Do this in remembrance of me*, for to warrant them herein, but others of them are ashamed of such an Interpre-

tation, as I shall shew afterwards. But if (*hoc facite*,) *Do this*, is as much as, *Sacrifice this* in remembrance of me, then all to whom Christ said *Do this*, must be understood to lie under the Command of *sacrificing* this, and so instead of making some Priests, we should make the whole Church proper Priests, for they are all bound to eat and drink the Sacramental Body and Blood of Christ, in remembrance of him: but I know they are not willing to make their Priesthood so common.

But yet again, there can be no inferiour proper Priests designed by God to offer up a proper Sacrifice under the Gospel; for if there be, they must be either after the Order of *Levi*, or of *Melchisedec*. Not after the Order of *Levi*, for that is no Evangelical, but the Legal Priesthood; nor after the Order of *Melchisedec*, for that only is appropriate to the person of our Lord Jesus, *Heb.* 7.3. And if any inferiour Church Officers shall presume to assume to themselves a Priesthood after that Order, it is but reasonable (upon demand) that they should shew us, that they have the qualifications of that Order, which are reckoned there by the Apostle, as he must be such an one who is a King as well as Priest, *vers.* 1. then he must be without Father, without Mother, without descent, having neither beginning of dayes, nor end of life, made like unto the Son of God, and who abideth a Priest continually: Such a one indeed is Jesus Christ, but shew us such another on Earth, and we will believe him to be of this Order; but untill then, we will be excused from believing any such inferiour *Priests* after that Order; and if there be none such, then is there no such proper Gospel *Priest*; and if there be no such proper Gospel *Priest*, then is there no proper Gospel Sacrifice for such to offer.

The *Papists* much deceive themselves, to think that the Gospel Ministers execute this our *Melchisedec*'s *Priesthood* on earth; for as *Melchisedec* the Type had no successor or delegate to officiate in his room, so neither hath Christ in this great Act of his *Priesthood*, which lies in offering up of a proper sacrifice. And indeed, to what purpose should he have any successor in this act of his Office, since his one sacrifice once offered, hath been sufficient to pardon the sins of the whole world, upon their Repentance, and Faith in him; and since he is now ever living in the Holy of Holies, as our High-priest, to make intercession through that same blood for us?

From what hath been said, it is evident, that under the Gospel Dispensation there is no man or men whatever, appointed by Christ as proper *Priests*, therefore there is no proper sacrifice on Earth to be offered, and consequently the Mass is no such sacrifice; for certainly, if he had ordained such a sacrifice, he would not have been unmindfull of ordaining a proper *Priest* for its Oblation.

(*Arg.* 4.) The Mass can be no proper Sacrifice Expiatory of sin, because it is not of a sweet-smelling savour unto God, which (I have proved) is a property of every sacrifice rightly offered.

That

That the Mass is not of a sweet-smelling savour unto God, I prove,

First, Because it derogates from the All-sufficiency and Perfection of Christ's one Sacrifice once offered on the Cross, as if that without the Mass could not expiate sin, and save the believing sinner; such a Derogation as this is blasphemy against the Sacrifice of the Son of God, making it less perfect and efficacious than indeed it is: But a blasphemous sacrifice is not of a sweet savour unto God, therefore the Mass is no proper sacrifice.

Secondly, The Mass is an Idolatrous sacrifice, therefore no proper sacrifice of Gods appointing, as being not of a sweet-smelling savour unto God. That it is Idolatrous, is evident; for what else is making a piece of Bread and a Cup of Wine the Redeemer of the World, and relying upon the Oblation thereof unto God, as upon the Redeemer of the World, for Life and Salvation. Such Idolatry as this is so far from being of a sweet savour unto God, that it is as all other Idolatry an abomination to him.

I know their reply is, But if this Bread and Wine be truely the Son of God, then is it no Idolatry: which is as good an Answer as if the Heathen condemned for worshipping a Stock or a Stone, should reply, But if this Stock or Stone be really and truely God, then are we no Idolaters. But say the Papists, their Cause and ours is different; for when they suppose their Stock or Stone to be truely God, they have no Revelation for what they say; but when we say this piece of Bread is turned into God-man, we have a Revelation. Well; and what is this Revelation? Why this: *Hoc est corpus meum*, This is my Body. But how if you are mistaken, (as we confidently believe you are) in taking a Figurative Expression for a proper Expression? Then you are Idolaters without doubt. But what a sad condition are these poor men in, in the mean time, that have nothing to secure them from damnable Idolatry, but the Interpretation of a very ambiguous Text, and I am confident therein, that they are mistaken.

Thus I have finished Four Arguments, to prove the Mass is no proper Gospel Sacrifice.

I return now to such sort of farther Arguments, with which I began, to prove that the Mass is not the same Sacrifice with that of Christ crucified, which is the only proper Gospel Sacrifice, and that therefore the Mass is no proper Gospel Sacrifice.

3 *Arg.* The Mass is not a Sacrifice of the same sort or Kind with that of Christ crucified, and therefore it cannot be the same sacrifice, and if it cannot be the same, it cannot be a proper sacrifice of the Gospel; for the proper Gospel Sacrifice is but one, or of one kind, as I have proved in the second Proposition.

That the Mass (if it be a Sacrifice, as the Papists say it is) is a sacrifice of a different nature or kind from Christ crucified, I prove thus:

First,

First, Because the Sacrifice of Christ on the Cross, was the Sacrifice of that very Body that was born of a Virgin (and not of a piece of Bread) by the overshadowing of the Holy Ghost; but the Mass (by the Papists own Confession) is the Body of Christ made of a piece of Bread, not born of a Virgin, by the consecrating words of a Priest, and not by the overshadowing of the Holy Ghost: Now is it possible that one and the same body can be born of a Virgin, and not made of a piece of Bread, and yet be made of a piece of Bread, and not born of a Virgin; or that one and the same body can be begotten by the the overshadowing of the Holy Ghost, without any consecrating words of a Priest, and yet be produced by the consecrating words of a Priest, and without that same overshadowing of the Holy Ghost, by which he first received his body? Is it not a contradiction?

Again, The Body of Christ sacrificed on the Cross had blood, and blood which was shed; but the body of Christ in the Masse sheds no blood, by the Papists own Confession: For they say the Mass is *Sacrificium incruentum*, an unbloody Sacrifice; now can a bloody Sacrifice and an unbloody Sacrifice be the very same, or of the very same kind?

Once more, The Body of Christ sacrificed on the Cross, had the shape and proportion of a Man, it was a Body that had head, hands, sides, feet, at their due distances as other humane bodies have. But in the Masse there is no such Body of Christ, in a like shape and proportion; for the Masse is a Wafer about the bigness of a shilling, that is not capable of any such dimensions, shape or proportion, that belong to an humane body. This doth so puzzle them, that it is a wonder to see into what confusions they run, when they are put upon explaining how the body of Christ, with his humane dimensions and proportions, can be contained in so small a thing as a Wafer. Some say, it is there with distinction of parts as it hung on the Cross: Others think, that is not likely, but they conceive Christs Body is in the Wafer as the Soul in the Body, that is, *Tota in toto, & tota in qualibet parte*, that is, the whole Body of Christ in the whole Wafer, and the whole body of Christ in every minute part of the Wafer: and what is this but to make Christs Body as a Soul, a meer Spirit, or else to make as many bodies of Christ in every Wafer, as it is divisible into parts, which will be almost if not altogether infinite. Others, to mend the matter, say, that Christs Body is in the Wafer after the nature of other Bodies; that is, it is *aliquid quantum*, but yet this *quantum* is *sine modo quantitativo*, which is as absurd as the rest; for these will have Christs body there, to be some long, broad, deep thing; but yet that it is long without length, and broad without breadth, and deep without depth; and if this is not to put on a brazen face and to talk Non sence impudently, I know not what is. If any shall consider these three differences (to mention no more) betwixt Christs Body on the Cross, and Christs Body in the Mass (as the Papists hold it to be) and yet will believe it is one and the self same body, and the very self-same sacri-

sacrifice, without any real difference; I see not why they may not believe the veryest Impossibilities, and grossest Figments that the Mind of man can possibly conceive.

But certainly, those three differences are sufficient to men in their wits, to speak the Sacrifice of the Mass (if it be a Sacrifice, as they would have it,) to be of a very different kind from that of Christ on the Cross, and consequently to be no true, proper Gospel Sacrifice; because (as I have proved) the true proper Gospel Sacrifice is but of one kind. I would clear up this by a supposition of a like case. Suppose some persons pretending to some great and infallible knowledge in the Mysteries of Nature, should shew us a little, white, round thing like an half-peny Ball (for I will put that instead of the little round Popish Wafer) and should with as great confidence endeavour to impose upon our Understandings, as the Papists do on our Faith, that this little round white thing is a Man and that it hath flesh, blood and bones, with all the distinct members of a Man. Upon this, we examining the thing as far as our Senses and Reason can judge, we find it looks like a Ball, the cover upon the touch feels like Leather, the inside seems to our feeling, as if it were stuft with hair or saw-dust; withall, it hath the lightness and every other quality of a Ball. Certainly, if these Impostors should be able by their confidence so far to prevail, as to perswade us that it is a man, yet surely, we should say, if it be a man, it is another kind of man than we are. So say I, suppose we should grant, that the Popish little Wafer is the Body of Christ, and a Sacrifice; yet certainly it is another kind of Body, and a Sacrifice, than that which was offered on the Cross: And (as I said) if it be but admitted to be a Body and a Sacrifice, but of another kind, it is certain it cannot be the proper Gospel Sacrifice, which I have proved already to be but of one kind, in the second Proposition.

4 *Arg.* The Mass cannot be the same proper Gospel Sacrifice with that of Christ on the Cross; because Christ on the Cross was sacrificed but once, but the Mass hath been (by the Papists own confession) offered as a Sacrifice above a Myriad of times.

That Christ the true proper Gospel Sacrifice was offered but once, I have proved in the third Proposition. That the Mass hath been, and is offered a numberless number of times, the Papists will not deny. Now see what a contradiction follows: If Christ crucified, the onely proper Gospel sacrifice, was and ought to be offered but once, and the Mass is the very same Gospel proper Sacrifice that is and ought to be offered infinite times; then may one and the self-same Gospel sacrifice be offered but one time, and yet infinite times; which is as much as to say, it is but once offered, and it is not but once offered.

Nor can they shift off this contradiction, by telling us, that Christs Sacrifice was but once offered with the shedding of his Blood, but it may be often offered without shedding of blood; I say this will not serve them.

them. First, Because a bloody sacrifice and an unbloody sacrifice cannot be the same: Nay, Secondly, I say, that an unbloody sacrifice is a contradiction *in terminis*, for there can be no proper sacrifice without sheddding of blood. Lastly, I say it is a distinction without any grounded difference, for the Scriptures do own a sacrifice of Christ with the shedding of blood, but owns no sacrifice of Christ without shedding of blood.

5 *Arg.* The Mass cannot be the same Sacrifice with that of Christ crucified, because Christ crucified was a sacrifice that expiated sin fully, and took it away for ever, as I proved in the fourth Proposition. But the Mass is not a sacrifice of that efficacy, therefore it cannot be really the same with that of Christ crucified. This latter I prove thus: First, Because the Mass takes away no sin as a Sacrifice; for if Christ on the Cross took away all sin from the Believer everlastingly, (as I have proved in the fourth Proposition, that it hath) then is there no sin left for the sacrifice of the Mass to expiate. Secondly, The Mass doth not take away sin fully and for ever; for if it did, why is it so often repeated as it is by the Mass-priests, who like the Priests of *Levi* stand daily ministring; which (as the Apostle saith) was an Argument that those Levitical Sacrifices were weak, and could never take away sin, and by a parity of Reason, so must be the Mass; if it be a Sacrifice, it must be a very weak one that cannot remove sin, and therefore is so often repeated by them. I conclude therefore, that the Mass is not really the same sacrifice with that of Christ crucified, and therefore no proper Gospel Expiatory Sacrifice. And thus I close up my Arguments against the Masses being a proper Sacrifice, all of them drawn from *Heb.* 10. 12. whence I took the rise of my Arguments, and with which I shall shut them up. *But this man, after he had offered one Sacrifice for sin, for ever, sate down at the right hand of God.*

The Popish Arguments for the Masses being a proper Gospel Expiatory Sacrifice, proposed and answered.

Let us now see what they can say for themselves, in the vindication of the Masses being a proper Expiatory Sacrifice.

Arg. 1. Their first Argument is this: *Melchisedec* was a Type of Christ, but the Bread and Wine *Melchisedec* brought forth (when he came out of *Sodom* to meet *Abraham*) was a real proper Sacrifice, therefore the Bread and Wine in the Mass, or (as we say) in the Lords Supper, is a proper sacrifice. Gen. 14.11.

Ans. This is wonderfull far fetch'd, but as it is, let us consider it.

I say then, *First*, It is but begg'd, when they say, that the Bread and Wine that *Melchisedec* brought forth, was a proper Sacrifice, for First, the Text calls it not so, nor was it of a nature capable of being a proper Expiatory

Expiatory Sacrifice, for that Bread and Wine had neither life to lose, nor blood to shed, which had been necessary to constitute it such a sacrifice. It is said indeed *Melchisedec* brought forth Bread and Wine, but it is not said he offered them up or sacrificed them: And certainly, to bring forth Bread and Wine is a phrase more suited to an Entertainment, and such most likely this was, if we consider the Occasion of his bringing them forth, which was in his meeting of *Abraham* returning from the spoyl of the spoylers of *Sodom*, it's likely he brought them forth for the refreshment of the tired Victors.

Again, If there had been any such mystery in this Bread and Wine of *Melchisedec*, as to typifie out the continuation of our Heavenly *Melchisedecs* Sacrifice in the Mass, is it likely that the Apostle in his Epistle to the *Hebrews*, when he is designedly unfolding the Old Testaments Types of Christ and his Sacrifice, and then also when he singles out *Melchisdec* as an eminent Type thereof, and sayes much concerning the Priesthood of that *Melchisedec*, and of its likeness to that of Christs, as he doth *Heb.* 7. I say, is it likely in that place he would have said nothing of this Bread and Wine, if it had been such a considerable Type as the Papists would make it to be? And yet whoever consults that place, will not find one *iota* in it, nor in the whole Epistle, relating to this same Bread and Wine; nor doth *Augustine* take any notice thereof in his Comment on that Text. I conclude therefore, that this Text serves them but as a wooden Legge to a lame Cause, which they use for want of a better.

Arg. 2. There is another Argument they urge to prove the Mass is a proper Sacrifice, and it is from *Malach.* 1. 11. The words are: *From the rising of the Sun, to the going down of the same, my Name shall be great among the Gentiles, and in every place Incense* (they read, but falsly, *a Sacrifice*) *shall be offered unto my Name for a pure Offering.* Now, say they, this being a Propheſie of Gospel-times, there must needs remain some Sacrifice with the Christian Church, that may be offered up in every place, which Sacrifice can be onely understood of the Mass, for there is ne're another Sacrifice under the Gospel that can stand in competition therewith.

Ans. The Answer to this is as easie as the burning of *Hay* and *Stubble*; for the force of their Argument depends on a false reading of the Text; for it is certain, that the word מְקֻטָּר which they translate *Sacrifice*, signifies not *Sacrifice* but *Incense*, as it is in our *English* Translation. Now see the weakness of their Argument; *Incense* shall be offered every where, therefore the Sacrifice of the Mass shall be offered every where, now who knowes not that Incense is no Sacrifice?

But if you ask, what may the Prophet mean by these words? I answer, That by *Incense* he means the Prayers and other spiritual Oblations of the Christian Church, but especially Prayers, according to that of *Revel.* 5. 8. *The four and twenty Elders fell down before the Lamb,*

having every one of them Harps and golden Vials, full of Odours, which are the Prayers of the Saints: By Odours is to be understood Incense, which is odoriferous; thereby signifying how sweet and acceptable the Prayers of the Saints are to God. Now wherever Christ hath a Church, there he hath these praying Saints; so that this Prophesie is exactly fulfilled therein, without the Masses being a Sacrifice.

Arg. 3. Their other Argument is this: The Types and Shadowes of Christs Sacrifice, under the Law, were proper Sacrifices, as those of Bulls and Goats, *&c.* Therefore the Sacrament at the Lords Supper (or the *Mass* as they say) must needs be a *proper* Sacrifice, else the Legal Types will be more excellent than the Evangelical Type or Sacrament.

Ans. I answer, this Argument halts down-right, both in its Antecedent, Consequence, and in the Reason of the Consequence.

(1.) As to the Antecedent, which ought to have been Universal, which it is not; for all the Old Testament types of Christs Death, were not proper Sacrifices, for the Brazen Serpent lift up on a Pole in the Wilderness, was a Type of Christ crucified, and so applyed by Christ himself, *Joh.* 3. 14. But the Brazen Serpent was no proper Sacrifice, which had no more Life to lay down nor Blood to shed than a Brass Nail hath, and therefore utterly uncapable of being a proper Sacrifice. Now (say I) if but this one Type of the Law might represent Christ sacrificed, and yet it self be no proper Sacrifice, by a parity of Reason may the Bread and Wine in the Lords Supper be a Shadow of Christ sacrificed, and yet neither the Bread or Wine be a proper Sacrifice.

(2.) Then for the Consequence, it is as unsound as its fellow, for it follows not, that because the Types of the Law were proper Sacrifices, representing the proper Sacrifice of Christ crucified, therefore the Sacraments of the Gospel, shadowing forth the same Christ sacrificed, must be proper Sacrifices also; because that Baptism is a Gospel Sacrament as well as the Lords Supper, and may typifie Christ washing us from our sins in his blood, and so be a shadow of a Sacrifice; and yet I know none that say that Baptism is a proper Sacrifice.

(3.) As for the Reason of the Consequence, that is very weak also, which is this, that if the Lords Supper be not a proper Sacrifice as well as the Legal Types, that then there is a greater Excellency in the Legal Types than in the Gospel Sacraments; and why so? Because, say they, proper Sacrifices are more excellent than meer commemorative Signs.

To this I say, the Legal Types compared with the Gospel Sacraments fall under a three-fold consideration.

1. If you consider them absolutely, as to the Nature of the things of which they consist: The principal Legal Types of Christ consisted of the Flesh and Blood of slain Beasts; under the Gospel, the Sacraments that shadow forth Christs Death, and our Benefits thereby, consist of Bread, Wine and Water. Under this consideration, there is no greater Excellency

cellency in these Types one above the other, than there is in the Nature of Bread, Wine and Water, above the Flesh and Blood of slain Beasts.

2. They may be considered with respect to the Sacrifice of Christ crucified, whom they all shadow forth; and in this respect they are equal, for they all were representative of the very same Christ crucified.

3. Lastly, they may be considered with respect to the different times, with the different advantages or disadvantages that respect their different Administrations; as the Law-types being before Christ was crucified, or the Gospel clearly or fully preached, by reason whereof those Types did more faintly and obscurely shadow forth this glorious Sacrifice of Christ crucified, which the Gospel Sacraments do more perspicuously perform, by reason of that clear Gospel Light that accompanies them; and it is upon this account that there is a transcendent Excellency in the Gospel Sacraments above those Legal Types, because hereby is more fully represented the incomparable Love of God to sinners in giving his Son to die for us, and thereby to purchase for us that full Remission of sins, and that glorious Eternal Life, with all other Gospel Priviledges: So that Gospel Sacraments cannot but influence our Minds and Hearts with more Light and Heat, and inravish our Souls with more Joyes, than possibly the dark Types of the Law could doe. I say therefore, upon this account it is that the Sacraments of the Gospel transcend the Sacrifices of the Law, and not as the Papists idly dream, because the Sacrament of the Gospel is a more excellent proper Sacrifice than all the Sacrifices of the Law. And thus much for answer to their third Argument.

Arg. 4. They have not done yet, in the next place they argue for the Masses being a proper Sacrifice from 1 *Corinth.* 5. 7. The words are these. *Purge out the Old Leaven, that ye may be a New Lump, for even Christ our Passeover is sacrificed for us; therefore let us keep the Feast not with Old Leaven.* Hence, say they, if the Apostle in this place speaks of the Feast of the Mass, and withall sayes, that therein Christ our Passeover is sacrificed for us, then is the Masse a proper Sacrifice.

Ans. To this I reply, First, It cannot be proved clearly, that the Apostle in this Chapter, or these Verses, is speaking of the Lords Supper, or Masse, as the Papists call it. Or Secondly, if that could be proved, it follows not, that therefore the Masse is a proper Sacrifice.

First, It is not certain that the Apostle speaks any thing in this place of the Lords Supper. For though he mentions a Feast, yet it is very doubtfull what kind of Feast he here means, for it may be onely a metaphorical Feast; and so *Paræus* and Dr. *Hammond* seem to understand it; that is, the continual Jubilee of a Christians Life, which consists of the Delicacies of Sincerity, without all Leaven of Hypocrisie, and of the

Peace and Joy that thence do arise, than the which there are no Feasts so delicious. Or Secondly, whether by Feast here he means the Love-Feast, (that carries that title in Scripture, and so doth not (as I remember) the Lords Supper, throughout the New Testament) which I think probable; for I find the Apostle *Jude* taking notice of this Love-feast, upon a very like Occasion to that of the Apostle in this place to the *Corinthians*, as in *Jude* 12. The Apostle there is complaining of a sort of men that had crept into the Church, and thereby were admitted to the Churches Love-feasts, who made no other use thereof than to satisfie their Luxury, *feeding themselves* (as he saith) *without fear*: Of which persons, and of which practice, he saith, *These are spots in your Feasts of Charity*; answerably the Apostle *Paul* is in this Chapter to the *Corinthians*, (speaking of the incestuous *Corinthian*) exhorting the Church to cast him out as old Leaven; and one Reason is, that they may be able to keep the Feast without such old Leaven as this *Corinthian*, who by his presence was likely to leaven others, by a secret Infusion of that Principle, that such kind of Incest (of which he was guilty) was very lawfull, and thereby might endanger others.

Having said thus much, to shew how very doubtfull it is to understand of what Feast the Apostle there speaks. Let us now grant, that by Feast is here meant the Lords Supper, yet it follows not that therefore the Mass is a proper Sacrifice, for the meaning of the Apostle will be only this, that since Christ our Passeover hath been sacrificed for us, ἐτύθη, and thereby hath (according to *Ephes.* 5. 25, 27.) sanctified a Church to himself, that he might present it glorious, *not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing*, that it might be holy and blameless; therefore (saith he) for this cause I exhort you to cast out this incestuous *Corinthian* from among you, and with him all other Leaven of Malice and Hpocrisie, that thereby as becoming a Church sanctified by Christs Sacrifice, ye may keep the Feast of the Lords Supper in a pure and sincere manner, answerable to these holy ends of his being sacrificed for you. And what now I pray, is in all this to prove this Feast a Sacrifice? for the Text sayes not, that this Feast is our Passeover sacrificed for us, but that Christ is our Passeover that hath been sacrificed for us, as the *Greek* word ἐτύθη should be rendred, of which this Feast can be but the Commemoration, according to the Institution, where Christ saith, doe this in remembrance of me, and thus much for answer to their fourth Argument.

Arg. 5. In the next place let us consider their Argument for the Masses being a proper Sacrifice, drawn from the words of the Institution. As first they say, when Christ said in the Institution, *Do this in remembrance of me*, he meant, *Sacrifice this*: *Bellarmine* thinks he hath found out a demonstration of the point in the words (*Doe this*) *Certum est*, (saith he) *probari Sacrificium Missæ his verbis* (*hoc facite*). And why so I pray? They tell us, because in some places the words *doe* and *make* are used to signifie Sacrifice: As *Levit.* 15. and 1 *Kings* 18. 23.

Lib. 1. *de Missa cap.* 12.

Ans.

Anſ. But how weak and vain a Reaſon is this, to build a demonſtration upon? That becauſe that in ſome places of Scripture where the Context ſpeaks expreſſely of ſacrificing, and the Prieſts are commanded to doe or make the Sacrifice ready; that therefore in this place, (where the Context ſpeaks not any thing of a Sacrifice, to which (*Doe this*) in this place is to be referred) it ſhould ſignifie *Sacrifice this*, is a conſequence (I had almoſt ſaid) ridiculous. For if *Doe this* in this place muſt be taken for *Sacrifice this*, becauſe *Doe this* in ſome places ſignifies ſo much, why muſt not the ſame words in every place where they be found ſignifie the ſame, and then ſee what abſurdities will follow: As when *Gideon* deſtroyed the Altar of *Baal*, the men of the City ſaid, *Judges* 6.29. *Who hath done this?* The meaning muſt be, *Who hath ſacrificed this*, and ſo the pulling down of *Baals* Altar muſt be the ſame with ſacrificing on it. Again when Chriſt ſaith to *Judas*, *What thou doeſt doe quickly*, Chriſt muſt thereby mean, *Judas, goe ſacrifice quickly*; as if *Judas* his betraying of his Maſter, and ſelling him for thirty pence, was a ſacrificing Act? what can be more abſurd? But what ſhould I ſay any more thereto, this Interpretation is rejected by ſome of their great ones. *Eſtius* the Jeſuite ſaith, by *Doe this*, the Scripture means not *Sacrifice this*; his words are, *Quod verbum (Facere) ſit idem quod ſacrificare quomodo nonnulli interpretati ſunt, præter mentem Scripturæ.* And ſayes their learned *Maldonate*, *Non quod contendum illud Verbum (Facite) illo loco idem ſignificare quod Sacrificare*; as much as if he had ſaid, I believe *Doe this*, ſignifies no ſuch matter as *Sacrifice this.* If then ſome of their own acknowledge the weakneſs of this Argument, no wonder then if we reject it.

Arg. 6. But they have another Argument from the words of the Inſtitution, which is this. When Chriſt ſayes of the Bread, *This is my Body broken for you*; and of the Cup, *This is the New Teſtament in my blood, ſhed for Remiſſion of ſins*; they thence argue, Where there is a Body broken, and Blood ſhed for remiſſion of ſins, there is a proper Sacrifice; But in the *Maſs* or Lords Supper there is the breaking of Chriſts Body, and the ſhedding of his Blood for the remiſſion of ſins: Therefore-----

Anſ. The Papiſts themſelves will ſave us the labour of anſwering this Argument, being rightly ſtated, as thus: Where there is a proper breaking of a Body, and a proper ſhedding of Blood for remiſſion of ſins, there is a proper Sacrifice; this is ttue: But in the *Maſs* there is a proper breaking of bread, and ſhedding of blood: This ſhould be the Aſſumption, which they themſelves deny; for *Suarez* the Jeſuite denies any proper breaking of the Body in the *Maſs*; For, (ſaith he) *breaking* in the proper and ſtrict Acceptation, ſignifies a dividing of the body into parts, but there is no ſuch diviſion of parts in the *Maſs*. Beſides, the Church of *Rome* hath left out of her *Maſs* the word (*broken*) uſed in the Inſtitution; and *Janſenius* a Papiſt gives the Reaſon why it is left out,

Ne-

Ne esset locus absurdæ intelligentiæ, quâ quis existimare possit verè frangi corpus Christi; that is, least any should absurdly think, that Christs body could be truely broken. And as to any proper shedding of blood in the Eucharist, *Bellarmine* himself disowns it, saith he, *Sanguis Christi in Missâ non reipsa egreditur de corpore.* So the Jesuite *Coster*: The true effusion of blood (saith he) which is by seperating it from the Body, was onely on the Cross, in *Cap. 9. de Sacrificio.* And this is as much as any Protestant can say, in dissolving this Argument; for if *breaking*, and *shedding of blood* in the Supper, is to be taken improperly, then is the Supper but an improper Figurative Sacrifice, representative of the true proper sacrifice, which we Protestants grant.

Arg. 7. The last Argument that (I shall take notice of,) they urge for the *Mass* its being a proper Sacrifice, is from 1 *Corinth.* 10. 21. where, say they, the Apostle is comparing the Table of the Lord with the Altar of Devils, and the Supper of the Lord with the sacrifices of *Jewes* and *Gentiles*; now, say they, if the Table of the Lord is as the Altars of *Jews* and *Gentiles*, and the Supper of the Lord or *Mass* is as the sacrifices of *Jews* and *Gentiles*, then is the *Mass* a proper sacrifice, because the sacrifices of *Jews* and *Gentiles* were proper sacrifices.

Ans. First, whereas it is said, that the Apostle here compares the Table of the Lord with the Altar of Devils, that is false; for the comparison is made betwixt the Table of the Lord and the Table of Devils; now who knowes not that there is a great difference betwixt a Table and an Altar, for on the Table the Worshippers did eat, on the Altar they did sacrifice; and who ever said that Eating was a sacrificing Act? nay the Papists themselves will not dare to say, that Eating of the Mass is a proper sacrificing Act, except they have a mind to consecrate all the people Priests, for they all eat of the *Mass*, and yet none may lawfully sacrifice but Priests.

Again, whereas they say, that the Apostle doth here compare the Lords Supper to the Sacrifices of *Jews* and *Gentiles*; this also is false, if you consider the Sacrifices of either *Jew* or *Gentile* in the most proper and strict acceptation thereof: for the Sacrifices of both the one and the other strictly taken, was that part of the Beast that was offered up unto God or Devils on the Altar, and not that part which either the Priests or Offering people did feed on upon their Tables; though by an improper way of speaking, those parts that were eaten may be called Sacrifices, because they were parts of those Beasts, some parts whereof were truely and properly sacrificed on an Altar. That the meaning therefore of the Apostle in this place may be cleared, I shall give you the plain sence of the Text, and not in my own, but in a Paraphrase of *Ataides Lusitanus*, one of the Council of *Trent.* *Quod Paulus dicit de participando Sacrificio Judæorum & de mensâ Dæmoniorum, si accipiantur ritus à Deo per Moysen instituti, & qui ab Ethnicis inter sacrificandum adhibiti, non inde effici Eucharistiam esse Sacrificium. Notum esse*

esse apud Moysen in sacrificiis votivis, totam victimam fuisse exhibitam Deo, atque unam partem ejus igni absumptum, quæ erat Sacrificium: ex eo quod erat reliquum, partem fuisse Sacerdotis, & alterum partem offerentis, utrumque partem suam comedisse quicum ipsi collibitum esset; neque id vocatum sacrificare, sed sacrificatum participare: Idipsum Ethnicos imitatos, etiam partem eam, quæ in Altari noti absumebatur à nonnullis vendi solitam, atque hanc esse mensam, quæ non est altare. Perspicuum ergo Pauli sensum hunc esse, Sicut Hebræi partem eam manducantes, quæ ad offerentem spectabat nempe sacrificii reliquias participes fiunt altaris, & Ethnici ad eundem modum, ità nos comedentes Eucharistiam participare sacrificium crucis. In English thus: When *Paul* speaks of partaking of the Sacrifice of the *Jews*, and of the Table of Devils, if those Rites (as they are instituted of God by *Moses*, and accommodated by the Gentiles to their Sacrifices) be rightly considered, it will not thence follow, that the Eucharist is a Sacrifice: For it is to be noted, that when *Moses* speaks of such Sacrifices that belonged to Vows, he declares, that the whole *Victim* or Beast was to be brought before the Lord, one part of which was consumed by Fire, which was the Sacrifice; of the other parts that were left, they were divided betwixt the Priest and the person that offered, both of which did eat their several parts as it best pleased them; but that eating was not called sacrificing, but partaking of that which was sacrificed. This very custom the *Gentiles* imitated, for that part of the *Victim* that was not consumed on the Altar, by some was wont to be sold, and is that which *Paul* calls the Table, which is not an Altar. The perspicuous meaning of *Paul* is, That as the *Jews* eating of that part which belonged to the Offerers, they thereby became partakers of the Altar; so we eating of the Eucharist, do thereby partake of Christ crucified. Thus he: The summe whereof is this, that the Apostle doth in this Discourse of his to the *Corinthians*, prove, that he that did eat at the Table of Devils, did thereby declare, that he religiously owned and worshipped those Devils as Gods, to whom part of that Beast of which they did eat, was sacrificed, and that therefore he advised them as all Christians, from a participation of those Feasts, which he sayes is inconsistent with our Eating of the Lords Table, which signifies that we own that God to be our God, to whom (not what we eat is sacrificed, but) to whom Christ was sacrificed for us, a remembrance whereof is by Christs appointment to be had in his Church in this Supper; but this doth not at all prove the Supper to be a proper Sacrifice, any more than that what the *Jews* or *Gentiles* did eat at their Tables were proper Sacrifices. And thus I have answered their most material Arguments the Papists have for the proof of the *Masses* being a *Proper Sacrifice.*

From the whole Discourse, let us make this improvement:

First, Let us be awakened hereby to observe what the Apostle *John* hath

hath cautioned us, when he saith, *Little children, keep your selves from Idols*; For certainly, there hath not been a more abominable Idol ever invented than this Popish *Mass*, wherein, to the dishonour of our Lord Jesus, a piece of Bread is made the Saviour of the World, and a proper Sacrifice for the pardoning of the sins both of the Living and the Dead. And that which aggravates this kind of Idolatry is, that they make Jesus Christ the Institutor thereof, and the Holy God to be the Former and Fashioner thereof, by the miracle of Transubstantiation.

Secondly, Let us hereby be awakened into Resolutions to keep close to Jesus Christ our great High-priest, our only Sacrifice, and Intercessor at the Right Hand of God; from whom so many thousand Souls have gone a whoring under the great Apostasie, after this filthy Idol. Christ sacrificed on the Cross we know, and Christ at the Right Hand of God we know, but Christ made of a piece of Bread, and again sacrificed in the *Mass* we know not. You are certain Christ was once crucified, and that that once was enough to make your Peace, and save you; look not after any other Sacrifice, for doubtless, as the Apostle sayes, *there remains no more Sacrifice for sins.*

Thirdly, Bless God night and day that hath kept you from this Apostasie, and pray God night and day still to keep you, especially in these times, when there are so many Seducers come abroad, to withdraw you from Jesus Christ to this dumb Idol.

Many other things I might have added, but it is high time to make an End.

SER-

SERMON XXIV.

Purgatory a Groundleſs and Dangerous Doctrine.

Mr Edward West

1 Cor. III. 15.

But he himſelf ſhall be ſaved, yet ſo as by Fire.

THis Text, ſayes *Bellarmine*, is one of the moſt difficult, and yet moſt profitable of the whole Scripture, in that from hence the Catholicks conclude two great points againſt Hereticks, that of *Purgatory* and *Venial* ſins. *Lib. 1. c. 5. de Purg.*

But as hard as the Apoſtles Text is, this ſort of Catholicks in drawing ſuch profound Notions from it, ſeem hard enough for the Apoſtle and his Text too; and I am much miſtaken, if *Paul* would not have been alike puzzled to have underſtood Them, as they are at a loſs to ſpell out the meaning of Him; it is not every one, nor may be, any one of that ſimple Age was aware of ſuch a thing as Pugatory or Venial ſin.

Auſtin it ſeems was of *Bellarmines* mind, as in the ſame place he quotes him, that this was one of the hard ſayings that *Peter* probably obſerved in *Pauls* writings, which we ſhould take heed of wreſting to our own deſtruction. *Auſtin* belike was wary, but others have ventured to bring it to the wrack, and made it ſpeak according to their mind, as reſerved and cloſe as it was, they will teach *Paul* to ſpeak plain, plain *Popery* ere they have done. And it is ſtrange to conſider how many hard Texts even in this obſcure matter they pretend to have for them, though in our Controverſies with them, we muſt wholly confine to plain ones: But theſe Magicians, in imitation as it were of *Moſes*, that eminent Man of God, are altogether for bringing water out of the

Rocks; if a place be hard in it ſelf, they think it will be too hard for us, and like a Mill-ſtone they caſt it upon us, urging us to give an evident ſence, or admit theirs; and while we are heaving to extricate our ſelves, they hope for this advantage over us, leiſurely to retreat from us, and before we overtake them agen, to prepare freſh work of the like kind for us; but it is a daſtardly Enemy that declines the open Field, and fights only for the Hedges and holes of Rocks, that it is greater difficulty to follow, than overcome them. To proceed:

An hard Text this is confeſſed to be, whereon we crave liberty to ſuſpect they may be miſtaken, and to ſuſpend our Faith till we have made examination.

But however a very *profitable* Text it is, if it affords ſuch Doctrines as forementioned, worth many thouſands by the year, I'le warrant you; for however ſome diſſemble the matter, on theſe ſuppoſitions it is, that Maſſes and Indulgences go off at the rate they doe: if Souls went forthwith to Heaven, they would not care a pin for them; if forthwith to Hell, they would deſpair of Benefit by them: But the Opinion of *Purgatory* makes them precious, eſpecially ſince, as is ſaid, *That Souls there are defective in merit, and cannot further merit in that ſtate themſelves*; they muſt needs, on this ſuppoſition, reckon themſelves more beholding to them that will impart of their Oyl to them; and in hope to partake of their Spirituals, can do no leſs than leave them a good ſhare of their Temporals.

Bell. *lib.* 2. c. 2. *de Purg.*

And to make them the more willingly give down their milk, *Aquinas* tells them, *That the Prieſts Prayers, Maſſes, &c. profit them when dead, by vertue of what they did themſelves while alive*; you may gueſs his meaning, The Prieſt ſhould profit him when dead, as his Purſe had profited the Prieſt when alive; and elſewhere he addes, *That Prayers are more effectual for us if we are particularly remembred, than if we are more generally recommended*; well, it is but meet that the Prieſt ſhould be particularly remembred, that particularly remembers us, and that ſomething ſhould be done, to rub up his memory of us in particular when we are gone: If *gain be godlineſs*, as ſome have ſuppoſed, certainly, this Doctrine of Purgatory is a prime Article of Religion; for all Experience as well as Reaſon teaches us, that it is a very *profitable* Doctrine.

Aqu. *Suppl. qu.* 71. *art.* 2.

Supl. qu. 71. *Art.* 12.

The Saints in Heaven are high and ſtout, they will give us nothing; the Damned in Hell are a poor or ſurly Rout; the one do's not need our prayers, the other does deſpiſe our prayers; we muſt threaten men with this priſon of Purgatory, or they will never pay their debts to us, but rather than lye and rot there, we may eaſily conclude, they will compound with us here.

But for clearer procedure, it will be neceſſary to ſhew,

1. *What the Papiſts do mean by Purgatory.*
2. *Whether any ſuch thing is probably meant in this Text.*
3. *Whether*

3. *Whether the Word of God does any where give ground for such a conceit, with that cogency especially, as that we should receive it for an Article of Faith.*
4. *I shall briefly consider (as they deserve) their Supplementary Arguments.*
5. *Shew what ground there is from Scripture to disbelieve any such thing.*
6. *What evil consequences there are of the Receipt of it.*
7. *And lastly, I shall give you the genuine sence of the place, and improve it.*

(1) *What do the Papists mean by their Purgatory?*

Ans. That there is a purgation of our Souls preparatory to their immediate enjoyment of God, *we* freely grant to them, and that both in respect of Guilt and Filth; and many wayes we assign whereby this is done; eminently by the Blood and Spirit of Christ, hereby filthy wretches indeed are said to be cleansed, 1 *Cor.* 6. 9, 10, 11. Christ was thought to have done this work effectually, what one way, and what another, *Heb.* 1. 3. and he reckoned so himself, as appears by his *sitting down*; his coming therefore was foretold, as with Fire and Water, that are the great cleansers amongst us, *Mal.* 3. 2, 3. Moreover, as Instruments that are effectual through him, this purging work is ascribed, sometimes and in some part to the Word, *Joh.* 15. 3. *Purifie them by thy Truth, thy Word is Truth*; at other times, and in another respect to Faith, *Acts* 15. 9. *Purifying their hearts by Faith*; sometimes to Afflictions, whence is that comparison *Psal.* 66. 12. *we went through fire and water*; so Afflictions are called, as being frequently used for our purging and cleansing: such a *Purgatory* we *Protestants* allow of; and are free to tell, that the place of it is this World; and that the Remainder of Sin, which sticks to the best of us while alive, is concluded in death; whereby the Body is incapacitated, and all its *moral* as well as *vital* Actions terminated; and wherein the Soul is perfected by the immediate Vision of God and Christ, into whose Image it is hereby changed, according to present Experience, 2 *Cor.* 3. 18. and after Hope, 1 *Joh.* 3. 2. *We shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is.* Protestants Purgatory.

But this will not serve our Adversaries turn, let us then hear and examine their Notion of *Purgatory.*

Bellarmine tells us in general, *That it is a certain place, wherein as in a prison, Souls are purged after this Life, that were not fully purged here, to the intent they may enter pure into Heaven.* *Lib. 2. de Purg. c. 6.*

Let us inquire of him a little more particularly,

1. Where this place is?

He tells us, that *the Church has not defined it, and that there are eight several Opinions about it*; Fancy you see is fruitfull; here is ee'n every one his tale, but such variety cannot but much please our company, *Ibid.*

yea and the Customers too; for if they like not one, they may take the other. But the generality of the Schoolmen will have it *in the bowels of the Earth, on the borders of Hell*; but be it where it will, I hope I shall never come thither; and, as I suppose they that thus inform us, had not been there; but all things are within the ken of the sagacious Schoolmen.

Lib. 2. de Purg. c. 6.

2. Who are to goe thither?

Eight Opinions also are reckoned up about this: Some thought *all men, good and bad*; others, *both Men and Devils*; others *all and only Catholicks*, (alas poor Hereticks) and so he goes on to the full number, charging one or more Fathers with each of them; and yet all but the last were out, as he concludes in the close of that Chapter; whereby I understand, that the Fathers are of no Authority, except when they speak for one; and so we as well as they will be content to be determined by them.

Bell. lib. 2. de Purg. c. 1.

But what at length is the true Opinion?

That Purgatory is onely for them that die with Venial Sins, or that depart, Cum reatu pœnæ, culpis suis remissis. This is crabbed Lattine, you will pardon me, if I cannot streight English it, I was almost stumbled before at *Venial sins*, but my Author helps me to understand what he means by them; *such as are worthy onely of a Temporal punishment.* These are petty kind of sins, but that Notion I pass over, as like to be examined by a much better hand: That which do's most puzzle me is this *Reatus Pœnæ*, This *guilt of Punishment that remains when the fault is pardoned*; and this Difficulty I think not easie to get over: For what is Guilt without respect to a Fault? and what place has punishment after Pardon?

Id. ibid.

Lib. 1. c. 11. de Purg.

But this is the best account we are like to have of what is to be purged in This Purgatory; some pitifull little sins, or such that were pardoned before; in effect I perceive, that persons that goe thither need only to be a little polish'd over. They are detained in that Prison for some few Farthings, that Christ when he payd their debts left on the score (alas for him, he was so poor) and for this they and their Friends must make a purse, and so they may go out; if they have good helpers, that will go Pilgrimages, say Masses, or procure Indulgences for them, they may go out so much the sooner, but if all lyes upon themselves, they must tarry longer; and thank themselves that by their Bounty they obliged no body they left behind them to merit a speedy Release for them; ('tis likely by this to go very hard with poor Folks and Churls) and to fright persons into a readyer complyance with them, the Grievousness of the punishment is set before them, Fire is the best that can be expected by them, and therein they may lye frying till the Resurrection, in some thousand years scarce making an Expiation.

And it is specially remarkable, that persons are not judged thither, *that the Fomes of sin may be washed, nor for any evil habits, that they may*

Bell. lib. 2. c. 9. de Purg.

may be amended, but purely that their leſſer debts (that Chriſt it ſeems had forgot, or was not able to diſcharge) *may by their perſonal Puniſhment, and their living Friends Piety and Prayers, be fully payed.*

And thus much for their Notion of Purgatory, as to its Place and Purpoſes.

(2) The Second thing to be inquired into is, *Whether it is this Popiſh Purgatory, that* Paul *means by the Fire in our Text?*

For my part I can hardly think it is, in that I find *Paul* ſuch a ſtranger in all his Writings to their Notion of it; *Venial ſins, Puniſhment after Pardon, Humane Satisfactions* by *tranſlation of ones works to another*, (when indeed no one has half enough for himſelf) *Prayers for the Dead*, and the like, which are Perquiſites of their Purgatory, he (good man) ſeeming utterly unacquainted with.

But he talks of Fire; and there is Fire in their Purgatory; what then? Are there not many Notions of Fire in Scripture? is not the Word, the Spirit, Afflictions, frequently ſet out by it? This they will not deny; there is no neceſſity then of interpreting this Fire by that of Purgatory; yea there is a great probability of the contrary:

1. In that it is certain, that the whole of *Paul*'s Diſcourſe here is a Metaphor, and it is likely that it is metaphorical Fire, that this metaphorical Stubble and metaphorical Builder is in danger of.

2. Whereas Fire is twice uſed before, it is evident, that it is not there to be underſtood of Purgatory-Fire, and muſt be ſo confeſſed by themſelves; and therefore it is unlikely having other Fire at hand, he ſhould run to Purgatory to fetch Fire, unleſs he had been a Diſciple of *Ignatius*, that can never kindle Fire enough.

For inſtance, of the Fire *v.* 13. it is ſaid, *that it ſhall try every mans work*; whereas Papiſts will yield, Purgatory is not for *tryal* of mens Works, they are tryed aud found ſlight before any one comes thither; nor agen, is Purgatory according to them, for *every one*, the *very good* and the *very bad* come not thither; therefore this cannot be underſtood of Purgatory-Fire.

Agen, the Fire which in the beginning of our Text is ſaid to *burn* ſome mens works, is the ſame with the Fire that *tryed* them, for *therein* ſome are expreſly ſaid to *abide*, and others to *burn*.

Moreover, their Purgatory Fire acts on Perſons, this on Works, and ſuch works as we cannot imagine how a material Fire ſhould touch, unleſs it can, as they ſay, *comedere ſecundas notiones*; for theſe works, as is clear by the Context, are corrupt Doctrines.

And what reaſon is there in this laſt clauſe to alter the Notion of Fire? One would eaſily conceive, that the Fire which the Builder eſcaped, was the ſame with that which burnt his Works, for we hear of no other that he was in danger by.

And if any Fire here ſpoke of, might be ſuppoſed to be underſtood meta-

metaphorically, much more this laſt, in that it is brought in with ſuch ſignal notes of compariſon, ὅτω ὡς, yet ſo *as by Fire*.

You ſee then, that this Text that looks faireſt for their purpoſe of any in all the Book of God, is ſo far from a Cogency, that there is not ſo much as a probability of its meaning any ſuch thing: Hitherto then we muſt be excuſed from receiving this Doctrine as an Article of Faith to be believed on pain of Damnation, as *Bellarmine* urges it; for we ſee no tolerable grounds to take it up for an Opinion. There is ſuch a deal of force to be uſed to theſe words, to make them ſpeak to the Popiſh purpoſe, that we may perceive them loth to own it; and for my part, if they ſpeak no plainer, they ſhall ſtand by a while, till we have examined other witneſſes.

Lib. 1. *c.* 15. *de Purg.*

(3) Let us enquire, *Whether the Word of God does any where give ground for ſuch a Conceit, with that cogency eſpecially, as that we ſhould require it as an Article of Faith?*

The principal Texts they uſe either directly or indirectly, as tending to this purpoſe, I ſhall briefly examine.

The firſt I am ſure they can think on, (and that you will ſay is far fetched,) is *Gen.* 3. 24. where God is ſaid to have placed *a flaming ſword to keep the way of the tree of Life*; this flaming Sword, ſay ſome of them, was a witneſs to ſinners, that they muſt paſs through Purgatory into Paradiſe.

Gen. 3.24.

Anſ. If we mind the ſcope of the words, that Text rather ſeems to have ſignified, That by the old way of Works there was no entrance into Paradiſe; for this Sword is ſaid to be *placed to keep the way of the tree of Life, leaſt man by eating of it ſhould live for ever*; and ſo makes rather againſt Purgatory, that ſeems a part or an Appurtenance of the old way of Works.

But a flaming Sword ſeemed a good Weapon, and they were willing to take it into their hands: and indeed their great Argument for all their peculiar Articles, has been *Fire and Sword*.

But to leave this Sword in the Cherubims hand, let us make a leap to 2 *Maccab.* 12. which is the alone place *Bellarmine* pitches upon in the Old Teſtament, as convincing in this matter; of all others he ſpeaks very ſlightly, however Fathers have made uſe of them, as if they were ſuch, *quæ ſolum probabiliter ſuadent*, and hereabout I ſhall have no controverſie with him, I think he has given them their full due.

2 Macc. 12.

Lib. 1. *c.* 3. *de Purg.*

The place then to be conſidered, is 2 *Maccab.* 12. 43, *&c.* where *Judas Maccabæus*, (as *Bellarmine* quotes him) is ſaid to *have gathered twelve thouſand drams of Silver, and ſent them to Jeruſalem, to be laid out in Sacrifices for the dead*; and the gloſs of the Author, he addes, *That it is a pious and a wholſom thought to pray for the dead, that they may be looſed from their ſins.*

Ibid.

Whence he inferres, 1. That the dead may be looſed from their ſins, and

and therefore there is a Purgatory: 2. That Prayers and Sacrifices doe profit the dead. Three other Inferences he draws, the least of which is, That Purgatory and Prayers for the dead must needs be an Article of Faith.

This text is their *Hercules* Club, that knocks all dead: other texts render it but probable, this it seems makes it clear and necessary to be believed, that there is a Purgatory.

Ans. To this we reply a great many things.

1. As to the matter of fact that is recorded of *Judas*, that he did raise a certain summe of money (though not 12000, but 200 drams, as the Greek Copy reads it) and sent it to *Jerusalem* to buy Sacrifices, I will not dispute against it, he might doe it, probably did it, and in his circumstances had good reason for it; but that he did it *pro mortuis*, or for the Relief of the Dead, that is *Bellarmines* forgery: the text sayes onely, *pro peccato*, *for the sin*, viz. lest being a notorious sin, the Living should be plagued for it; and that this was his case, appears by *v.* 42. *They prayed that the sin might be blotted out, and Judas exhorted the multitude to keep themselves* ἁγναγεῖτες, *free from the sin, seeing the punishment of them that had committed it*; and this is an Interpretation of his fact, that agrees to the letter of the Text, and the Analogy of Faith.

2. As for the Authors gloss (*what a piece of piety it is to pray for the dead*) we are not much concerned in it; for whoever was the Author of it, whether *Jason* or his Abbreviator, (as may seem 2 *Maccab.* 2. 24.) and however good an Historian he was, we own him for no Prophet; nor did the Church of the *Jews* ever look upon his Writings as Canonical, as Papists themselves confess; though *Bellarmine* sayes the Christian Church did, he gives slender proof of it: *Austin* indeed sayes, *It was received of the Church not unprofitably, provided it was soberly read*; where he seems to caution against some dangerous passages in it, by which unwary Readers might be prejudiced, as much as the more wise profited. Bell. *de Purg. lib.* 1. *c.* 3.

But the Author himself acquits us from any veneration of him, by his courting his Readers favour ever and anon, and desires their pardon at least, if any thing had been said amiss, which are condescensions below the Spirit of God, or any Author inspired by it. 2 Macc. 2. 26. 2 Macc. 2. 25.

3. If this Author had been good, and the *Jews* there had prayed for the Dead, the Papists Inference of Purgatory, according to their own principles is weak: For it seems also by their Faith, that people may be prayed out of Hell; though this they will not grant for ordinary, lest it should spoyl their Purgatory; yet two Instances they very confidently give of it, which speaks a possibility: One of *Trajan* a bloody persecutor, upon the Prayers of *Gregory*; of which *Damascen* sayes, the whole East and West were witnesses: And the other of *Falconilla* a Pagan Woman, by the prayers of St. *Thecla*. And if there was need of

any

any more ſuch ſtuff, the Scull of a certain Gentile Prieſt told *Macarius*, that its owner was delivered out of Hell by his Prayers; and here is as good Authority, as our Adverſaries will bring by and by for their Purgatory: Though I muſt confeſs, theſe Inſtances, as going againſt the hair, do not over-cleaverly go down; for though they hugely advance Prayer, they quite race Purgatory; to make up therefore differences between the combatants on each party, *Aquinas* tells us, (and he ſeems to moderate well, like an Angelical Doctor,) *That they were not finally ſent to Hell, but according to their preſent merit; and that probably they were firſt raiſed to life, and ſo repented ere they were tranſlated to Heaven, and alſo that this was not by common Law, but ſpecial priviledge*, an Act as it were of *Chancery*. But however it was, if one late Penitent, though but one, is thought ſufficient to prevent every ones deſpair, two ſuch inſtances of damned perſons recovered to grace, are ground enough to encourage Prayer for all the reſt.

Suppl. qu. 71. art. 5.

And if Fathers would make theſe fantaſtick arguments Authentick, it was eaſie to give many that ſpeak probably, as if they half believed ſuch a thing, as the poſſibility of a deliverance from Hell. *Origen* goes a great way beyond us; let us hear what *Auſtin* ſayes, that they would make their great man for Purgatory; *Aquinas* denyes not, but that it was his ſaying, *That Suffrages did profit the dead either for a full abſolution, or more tolerable damnation:* Both which muſt referre to their ſtate in Hell; there is no proper Damnation in Purgatory, and Remiſſion is ſaid to be granted before they go to Purgatory; onely an imaginary guilt remains there, that may be properly enough purged in an imaginary place, by an imaginary Fire, ſuch as (for ought we yet hear of Purgatory) that ſeems to be.

Sup. qu. 71. art. 5.

And thus I conceive the force of this Text is fully enervated, the fact being ſhewen to have been miſconſtrued, the gloſs not duely authorized, and the Inference not firmly grounded.

We muſt now paſs into the New Teſtament, and there the moſt likely Texts ſeem to be *Math.* 12. 22. where it is ſaid of the Blaſphemy againſt the Holy Ghoſt, *that it ſhall never be forgiven, neither in this World, nor that which is to come*; hence conclude they, that ſome ſins are forgiven in the other world, and therefore a Purgatory.

Matth. 12. 22.

Anſ. 1. I deny the Conſequence, for according to their Opinion; as you have foreheard, Purgatory is for perſons whoſe ſins are already *forgiven.*

2. The Original is, οὔτε ἐν τούτῳ τῷ αἰῶνι, *neither in this Age, nor the Age to come*; where the preſent Age may ſignifie the *Judaick ſtate*, wherein Grace was ſtreighter; and the future that of Chriſts Kingdom, wherein it was expected larger. Thus *age to come* is often took, as probably *Heb.* 6. 5. and according to ſome readings, *Iſa.* 9. 6. Chriſt is called in ſtead of *everlaſting Father*, πατὴρ τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος, *the Father of the Age to come.*

But

But if this will not be admitted,

3. Let *Matthew* interpret himself by what he sayes in the former verse, where he tells them without this Exaggeration, that it *shall not be forgiven*; and to omit Fathers, let me only referre them to his *Brother Mark*, Mark 3. 29. where it is simply rendred, *that he hath never forgiveness*, but is *in danger of*, or obnoxious to *Eternal Damnation*, ἔνοχος ἐστὶν αἰωνίου κρίσεως. both the former Ages are here wrapt up in the one of Eternity, as it were to correct the Popish nicety.

Another Text they make use of, is *Mat.* 5. 25, 26. where we are advised, *to agree with our adversary quickly, while in the way, lest the Adversary deliver us to the Judge, and the Judge to the Officer, and we be cast into Prison, for we shall by no means come out thence, till we have payd the utmost farthing.* Mat. 5. 25, 26.

Here also Papists do see, Venial sins in the Farthings, Humane Satisfactions in the Pay, Purgatory in the Prison.

But that no such things can with any Congruity be hence inferred, you may observe,

1. That it is questionable, whether this is any Parable, or looks any further than the Civil differences between us and our Brother, which we should speedily take up among our selves, by the common Rule of Equity, and not suffer needlesly to come before the forensick Judges, where we may expect utmost severity; the Context inclines to this, and so this Text is expounded by *Chrysostom*, *Theophylact* and *Hierom.*

2. If a Parable; on that account, by the common Rule of the Schools it is not Argumentative, especially in an Article of Faith.

3. Its Scope must be intended, and not every particular word wracked, and that seems to be only this, That we should make our Peace with God in this Life, and as soon as we can, in that here we may expect Mercy; whereas, if we put off matters till we come before Gods Tribunal, we shall be dealt with in all severity, God will not abate us an Ace then, he will exact the utmost farthing; he will not then hear of Remission, or Composition, that we are like to go to eternal perdition; the Prison is Hell, and there is no relief from the [*untill*;] for the impossibility of the Condition makes that but a bare Supposition, and it is all one with *never*: as to which Resolution of the matter, we have Abettors, some of the most considerable of the Popish Doctors, *Maldon. in loc. Tolet. in Luc.* 12. *Jansen. Concord. Evang.*

A further Text *Bellarmine* layes great stress upon, is 1 *Cor.* 15. 29. *What shall they doe that are baptized for the dead? if the dead rise not at all, why are they then baptized for the dead.* 1 Cor. 15. 29.

This we must confess is a difficult place indeed, and has wrested many great wits; but Papists think, that by way of requital as it were, they may wrest it, and by *Baptisme* understand all their voluntary services for the dead, supposing hence that they may thereby profit the dead, and

conſequently, that there is a Purgatory, wherein they are detained, till by theſe means they are relieved.

Anſ. 1. Their Notion of Baptiſm is perfectly new coyned, for though Afflictions which in the Old Teſtament are frequently ſet out by Waters, are ſometimes in the Goſpel couched under this Name of *Baptiſm*, *Mat.* 20. 22. yet Prayers, Alms, Sacrifices, and ſuch like voluntary ſervices were never ſo expreſſed, nor with any pretence of Reaſon can be thereby underſtood.

2. If this was granted, Purgatory could not be hence inferred, for this Baptiſm whatever it was, referred to the Reſurrection of the *Body*, as a typical repreſentation of that, whereon it is made uſe of, for Confirmation of the Faith of that; whereas Purgatory according to them is onely for the Relief of the *Soul*; that were we wholly at a loſs for the poſitive meaning of the Text, or ſhould we be out in our gueſs at it, they could reaſonably take no advantage of it; for to whatever it ſerves, it ſerves not to their purpoſe, the Body and its Reſurrection, and not the Soul and its Purgation being concerned in it, as by the Context clearly appears.

But however, to take Occaſion to explain that very puzzling Text:

1. Some referre it to a corrupt Cuſtom took up by the *Cerinthians* and *Marcionites*, of Baptizing a living perſon inſtead of his Friend which was dead, which *Paul* makes uſe of to their Conviction, without his own approbation. Let this have what weight it will with others, I muſt profeſs it little ſwayes with me.

2. Others think this Baptiſm referres to the waſhings that were uſed about the dead, which ſhewed hope of their Reſurrection, otherwiſe why ſhould they make ſuch a doe about the Bodies of them: Of this Cuſtom we hear ſomething *Acts* 9. 37. but then we muſt take Baptiſm here in the middle Voyce, and read the Text, *Why do they baptize, or uſe Waſhings about the dead.* Let this Notion go as far as it will, I know no hurt in it.

3. According to others, Baptiſm may be here took for Sufferings, and ſo this Clauſe may be much the ſame with what follows in the next Verſe, *Why ſtand we in jeopardy?* Why do we thus expoſe our Bodies, if they ſhall never be reſtored to Life?

Let me adde a Fourth Notion, that takes Baptiſm in a literal Sence, and ſuppoſes an Ordinary Figure of one Number for another, where there is ſpeech of the dead; and that the meaning is, If the Dead riſe not, what ſhall become of us and our Baptiſm, that are baptized into *Jeſus* who is dead, for *if the dead riſe not*, as he there ſayes, *Chriſt is not riſen*, and conſequently our Goſpel and *hope is vain*; and thus by a ſmall diſpenſation with Grammar, which the Apoſtle does not exactly tye himſelf to, we have a plain and ſafe meaning of this difficult Text; however in regard of its difficulty, I ſhould judge it very improper, to make it the Baſis of any new uncouth Article; I would rather uſe it for confirmation

firmation of one that was otherwise sufficiently bottomed, and would keep to the Apostles scope in the Application of it, till I had its fuller and surer interpretation; and that certainly is, to confirm us from something in use among us, of the future Resurrection.

The last Text I shall mention, that is of any probability, is 1 *Pet.* 3.19. where Christ is said *by the Spirit to have gone and preached to the Spirits in Prison, that were sometimes disobedient in the dayes of Noah.* 1 Pet. 3. 19.

This Prison they dream is Purgatory, and it seems that there is preaching in it too, but to what purpose, if there be nò repenting or changing of Estate, as every where Papists confess there is not in Purgatory? and I suppose while the Scripture speaks of the so great wickedness of the world before the Flood, they will not think that the men of that Age went generally to Purgatory, and therefore Christ might have had but few Auditors, if he had gone thither to have preached to them.

The plain meaning of that Text is, that Christ by his Spirit in *Noah* did once preach unto that Generation, whose Spirits are now in hold as Criminals for their then disobedience, of which preaching of *Noah*, and the strivings of this Spirit, we hear, 2 *Pet.* 2.5. *Gen.* 6.3.

But to suppose Christs personal going into those dark Regions, to preach the Gospel to Spirits so long departed, is a ridiculous Fable, and destructive even of their own Notion of Purgatory; that reckons the present Life the Way, the Race, and that hereafter is no opportunity to obtain Grace, but satisfie Justice.

Such shifts then they are put to, that right or wrong will take upon them to defend a bad cause; and yet as little as these Scriptures I have quoted make for them, and as much as in truth they make against them, they are their chief Weapons: If I should mention several others, I could propose no other design than to shame them; but it may be they will say, Doe that if I can; I shall however forbear, in that it may be an harder task than I am aware, for some folks have Whores Foreheads, and will not be ashamed.

(4) Let us now *briefly consider their Supplementary Arguments*; which ordinarily are from these heads.

1. *Reasons.*
2. *Fathers.*
3. *Councils.*
4. *Consent of Nations.*
5. *Revelations.*

I. Let us hear their strong *Reasons* for a Purgatory, and the first I find to be this: *Reasons.*

First, *In that some sins are Venial, and onely worthy of a temporal Punishment, and it is possible a man may depart out of this Life onely with* Bell. *de Purg.* c.11.l.1.

these, Therefore it is necessary that they should be purged, and expiated in another.

Reason. Secondly, *When Sinners are reconciled to God, the whole Temporal Punishment is not alwayes remitted with the Sin, and a man may die before he has discharged it, and therefore in the other World he must make it up*; and hereon a Purgatory seems necessary.

And these are all the Reasons *Bellarmine* gives us, but adde what I shall consider under the following distinct heads; and by this you'l see upon what lame legges this great Doctrine stands: For,

1. We utterly deny any Sin, to be in this sence *Venial*, having learn'd out of the Scriptures, that *the wages of sin*, one as well as another, *is death*, *Rom.* 6. 23.

2. Though we allow of Fatherly Chastisements that God layes on his people here, for others example, and their own amendment, as a
Rev. 3. 19. fruit of Love rather than Justice; we understand nothing of a proper punishment by way of *personal* Satisfaction that is required of us, when God has pardoned us; having learnt, that *God does Abundantly pardon where he pardons*, *Isa.* 55. 7. and having confidence that Christ has fully satisfied, where he has undertook to satisfie, *by one Sacrifice Perfecting for Ever them that are sanctified*, *Heb.* 10. 4. and that *there is No condemnation to them that are in Christ*, *Rom.* 8. 1. And we reckon it absurd, that we should be loosed in respect of our Greater sins, by the sufferings of another, and held for our slighter Peccadillo's to make satisfaction in our own persons; we cannot conceive why Christ that payd the *pounds*, should grudge the *pence*; after he has payd our Debt, he should suffer us to lye for Fees. If there was a meetness we should smart for any of our sins, one would expect it rather for our *great ones*; but the Goodness that passes over them, will not disparage it self to take notice of *little* things; but we assure our selves where it sets on Forgiveness, it will make clear work, *forgiving iniquity*, *transgression and sin*, that all Glory may be to God.

3. We suppose the wise Providence of God do's so far subserve his Covenant, that no surprizal shall happen to them interested in it, to cut them short of the full benefit of it, and that God will continue them in this Life, till he has fitted them for a better; otherwise *David* was out in his Notion of Gods Covenant, that reckoned it *ordered in all Things and sure*, 2 *Sam.* 23. 5. and we are abused in what we hear of his exact and accurate Providence, *Matth.* 10. 29, 30. If this be all *Bellarmines* Reason for a Purgatory, to catch those of God's people that shall drop out of his providential hand, that they may not quite fall into Hell, he may content himself, God is not so careless of his own matters, or People, as he would make him; his Fruit drops not off the Tree of its own accord, that there should be danger of its falling before it was ripe; but he gathers it in convenient season, so that there is no need of a Purgatory, wherein it should lye mellowing. You see by what we have

replyed

replyed in these three particulars, how streightened they are for Reasons, that they must extenuate the Desert of Sin, lessen the Merit of Christ, and reflect on the wise Providence of God, to have any shew of one; and I must professs, had I hæsitated at the Doctrine of *Purgatory* before, such Reasons as these for it, would have confirmed me in the disbelief of it; *'Tis time to desert that Faith, where I cannot be a Believer, without being also a Blasphemer.*

II. Their Second Argument is from *Fathers*: As to which I briefly reply, that upon Examination I find some false Fathers imposed, others falsly quoted, others falsly applyed to what they never intended, as was easie to give instances, were they not from other hands so abundantly ministred. Fathers.

And further I find, (as is said of a certain people) that they sell powder to Friend and Foe, whereby a great noyse is made, and a great smoak is raised, in which a man may soon lose his Religion, but I pity the poor man that is to seek it among them.

And herein I acknowledge God very good to his Church, discouraging her by this Humane uncertainty from pinning her Faith on Man, and directing her to his infallible Word, on which alone she can safely and reasonably settle; and such an Observation I conceive put the Spouse on that particular Inquisition after Christ himself, *Cant.* 1. 7. *Tell me, (O thou whom my Soul loveth,) where thou feedest, where thou makest thy flock to rest at Noon; for why should I be as one that turneth aside* (or sitteth Vailed after the manner of Harlots) *by the flocks of thy Companions?* That Church that would keep it self chaste, must be aware of wanton Shepheards, how it sits down by them, or dallyes with them, and keep close to Christ, that it may be delivered from them; and that Church or Society of men is a Strumpet, that draws a Veyl over its own Eyes, not caring to distinguish between Christ and his Companions; that listens to every ones Voyce, and receives every ones Embrace; *Christs sheep know his Voyce, and follow him, and a stranger they will not follow, but will flee from him, for they know not the Voyce of strangers, Joh.* 10. 4, 5. And a Stranger he is, and a strange voyce he has, that speaks not according to what is written, and so he should be looked on by you, *Gal.* 1. 6, 7, 8, 9.

I speak not this to disparage the true Fathers, but I fear, as by the body of *Moses*, (if he could have found it, or *Michael* would have delivered it,) the Devil had a design of imposing upon *Israel*; so under the name of divers upright and eminent Fathers, the Deceiver of the Nations, and his Prophets, have obtruded upon the World many gross Superstitions and corrupt Doctrines, whereof it is but needfull we should take caution, especially if there appears to us the Ghost of an ancient Father, long dead, and hid from former Ages, and raised by we know not what Inchantments of later Impostors, speaking things dissonant to the Analogy of Faith; as is the case in respect of divers of those Fathers the Papists urge. Deut. 34. 6. Jud. 9.

urge us with, as *Dyoniſius*, *Clemens*, *Ephrem*, &c. But univerſally it is a good Rule, to beware of Men, and have your eye to the Word of God, *which is able to inſtruct you to every good work.*

2 Tim. 3. 17.

Councils.

III. They pretend alſo *Councils* in the Caſe.

To which pretence I reply, that we find none of Antiquity or Univerſality to move us in the matter; nor for ought appears, was it ever induſtriouſly handled till the Council of *Florence*, not much upward of two hundred years, as *Bellarmine* himſelf ſeems to grant; on occaſion of Pope *John* the 22th. being impeached of Hereſie, as believing the ſleep of all Souls till the general Reſurrection, he plainly tells us, that he *believed ſo, while it was lawfull for him ſo to doe without danger of Hereſie, for the Church had not then defined what in that caſe was to be believed.* And conſequently the diviſion of our dead Saints into thoſe in Heaven and in Purgatory, even according to him, was not determined in any antecedent Council; and we are not moved by an *Article of Faith* that is ſo novel; our Creed was compleated 1600 years ſince, whereas it ſeems this great Article of Purgatory is not of 300 years ſtanding; for before then we might ſafely have believed all Souls quiet enough. And the truth of it is, this Opinion did prevail, *as an Opinion*, among ſeveral of the Ancients, and was probably the true foundation of thoſe Footſteps of Superſtition that we find among them in reference to the Dead; yet though this Foundation by the Popiſh Church it ſelf is raced, the Popiſh *purgatory*, upon the Superſtructure of ſtraw that the Ancients laid thereon, is principally founded; as in all their Treatiſes of that Subject may be obſerved.

Bell. *de Rom. Pont. lib.* 4. *c.* 14.

Conſent of Nations.

IV. The Fourth Argument is, from general *Conſent of Nations*; and here *Bellarmine* reckons up the *Hebrews*, the *Mahumetans*, and the *Heathens*.

Lib. 4. *de purg. c.* 11.

I had expected he would have brought in the *Greeks* alſo; and it may be ſuppoſed he took that for granted, in regard he had quoted ſo many of the *Greek* Fathers in the former Chapter, that *for ought I perceive ſpake good Greek*, if that would end a controverſie; or however, ſay our *Neotericks*, the *Greeks* differed in this point heretofore, they agreed to it in the Council of *Florence*; where the *Greek Emperour* Paleologus, *and* Joſeph *the Patriarch of* Conſtantinople, *with divers Greek Biſhops were preſent, and gave their conſent in the diſputed point of Purgatory.*

In anſwer to this, I reply only two things, (for I am loth to loſe the *Greeks*, I muſt confeſs, being ſo conſiderable a Body of Chriſtians.)

De purg. lib. 1. *c.* 2.

1. That *Bellarmine* does yield the *Greeks* to be ſuſpected at leaſt of Hereſie in this buſineſs, and the *Armenians* alſo, and brings in *Aquinas* as of his mind; and yet further feeds his ſuſpition from the proceeding of the very Council of *Florence*, whence later Writers would perſwade us of their being right for the buſineſs.

2. Whatever was done by the *Greek* Biſhops in that Synod, the reſt of

of the *Greek* Churches disowned when they came home, and interdicted them all Christian Burial for their pains; and a fatal Council this is noted every way to have been to the *Greeks*, for in it the Patriarch dyes, presently after the Emperour, and within fourteen years after, *Constantinople* is took by the *Turks*, the Emperours Brother slain, the *Greek* Empire dissolved, the Christians of those parts inslaved, and gave thereby to find *their Purgatory* in this world. *Symson.*

As to their pretension to the *Hebrews* as being for Purgatory, they have shewed their proof, 2 *Mac.* and it is needless further to disprove them.

For the *Heathen*, especially the Poets, I think we may grant several of them, as Abetters, and I suppose *Fathers* of this profound Notion.

As to the *Mahumetans* also I will not much dispute, nor wonder if I find Purgatory in their *Alcoran*, since *Sergius* the Monk was one of the Authors of it.

And on recollection of the whole, this specious Argument of *Consent of Nations* results, in the sweet Harmony of *Turks*, *Papists*, and Heathen Poets; and like enough, if we would trace them, they agree in more points than this, and herein let them glory on, while we comfort our selves in our *redemption from our vain Conversation received by Tradition from our Fathers.* 1 Pet. 1. 18.

V. The Fifth and last Argument is from *Apparitions*; and here I might tell you abundance of pretty storyes, were it worth the while. Apparitions.

But as to these I must frankly say, that if they had been true, (whereas the generality of them smell of fiction,) and if there had been ten, where we hear onely of one, it would have made this Doctrine more suspicious; it seems hereby the interest of Hell to promote such Fancies; These Phantasms, Ghosts, or what else you will call them, were never, as I find, *allowed Preachers*, nor do any of the Monks record that they shewed them their *Orders*, and it is observable, they came with different stories, some describing a Popish Purgatory, and others as it were a *Turkish* Paradise; but God has directed us to *Moses and the Prophets*, and upbraided *inquiring for the Living, of the Dead.* So that I look on all of this Nature as diabolical Delusion, and the heeding of such things as a great declension from God, and the very precipice unto all superstition. And now let Papists further brag, that they have not onely *Turks and Heathens, but even Hell it self of their mind.* Luk. 16. 29. Isa. 8. 19.

But we have followed them too far in their Fopperies, let us briefly inquire,

(5) *What ground there is from Scripture to disbelieve any such thing as Purgatory?*

1. The Scriptures mention onely a two-fold State of Persons departed this Life, placing some in Heaven, and others in Hell; and accordingly allure the Good by the Hopes of one, and fright the Bad with the Scripture Grounds to believe no Purgatory.

Threats

Threats of the other, never ſetting before us for Encouragement or Diſcouragement any Third ſtate after this Life; *Mat.* 16. 16. *He that believeth and is baptized, ſhall be ſaved, and he that believeth not, ſhall be damned*: and leaſt Sophiſters ſhould except, that he ſayes not he ſhall *preſently* be ſaved, but by the intermediation of Purgatory, we find it elſewhere, even in words of the *preſent* expreſſed, *Joh.* 3. 36. *He that believeth on the Son, hath everlaſting Life*; and on the contrary, *the wrath of God is ſaid to abide on him that doth not.*

2. The Scripture makes onely a two-fold diviſion of Saints, in reſpect of *place*, dividing the *whole Family* into them *on Earth*, and *them in Heaven*, *Eph.* 3. 15. Therefore none that are under his Fatherly Love and Care, can well be ſuppoſed elſewhere.

3. The Saints that undoubtedly knew the mind of God, have not onely been aſſured themſelves, but have aſſured one another, that on their bodily death, they ſhould goe forthwith to Bliſs: whence is that, *to me to dye is gain, I deſire to depart, and to be with Chriſt*, *Phil.* 1. 21. And agen, 2 *Cor.* 5. 8. *We are confident I ſay, and willing rather to be abſent from the Body, and preſent with the Lord*; ſo the converted Thief expected and was aſſured, (when he had no time to make perſonal ſatisfaction, as the Papiſts require) *This day ſhalt thou be with me in Paradiſe*, not Purgatory; there to be ſure Chriſt is not; and where he is, there you may all along obſerve, they expect to be, and that immediately; *Lazarus* is no ſooner dead, but he is ſeen in *Abrahams* boſom, which ſure was a place of Reſt; and in general, they are pronounced *bleſſed that dye in the Lord, as reſting from their labours*, *Rev.* 14. 13. And leſt this ſhould be reſtrained to Martyrs, and the former to eminent Saints, (*ſuch as the Thief for inſtance*) we hear it, that good men, without exIſa. 57. 1, 2. ception, *are taken hence* in pity, that they may be *freed from preſent evil*, and go to reſt after their hard labours; which certainly implyes not, their being caſt into Purgatory-fire, if it be ſo fierce eſpecially, as it is painted.

4. The Scripture ſpeaks of Chriſt as having fully ſatisfied, and of Believers as being intirely ſanctified, and thereon at peace with God, and as rejoycing in hope of the Glory of God, looking on all the Afflictions that remain as flea-bitings, little momentany things, which they would not certainly have ſpoke ſo contemptibly of, if they had thought they might have layn ſome thouſand years in Purgatory-flames: No, they reckoned onely *of the Sufferings of the preſent time*, not dreaming of any afterwards, but on their *Juſtification by Faith* concluded *of their Peace with God.* And agen, they are ſpoken of *Joying in God through* Rom. 8. 18. *their Lord Jeſus Chriſt, by whom they had* Now *received the Attone-*Rom. 5. 1. *ment*; they did certainly expect that God had no after-reckoning for *V.* 11. them; their *ſmiling look* on God, ſpoke evidently they thought not of further Severities from him.

5. The Scripture ſpeaks of God as *throughly* pardoning upon our repenting;

repenting; *Ezek.* 18. 22. *All his Tranſgreſſions that he hath committed, they ſhall not be mentioned unto him.* Heb. 8. 12. *I will be mercifull unto their unrighteouſneſs, and their ſins and iniquities I will remember no more*; whereas he would remember them with a witneſs, if he ſhould throw them into that dark Priſon, till they had made in their own perſons an Expiation, by ſuch ſufferings as are not to be parallel'd on Earth.

6. The Scripture ſpeaks expreſly of this Life as our Way and onely working-time, and that *in the night* of Death *no man can work*; and moreover, *that every man ſhall receive according to what he hath done in the Body*, 2 Cor. 5. 10. *He* and not another, *Done* and not ſuffered; *in the Body*, while Soul and Body were together, and not what the Soul ſhould doe apart; and indeed, what is done out of the Body, is not the act of the man, and ſo can tend neither to his good or hurt, and conſequently, what the *Soul* is ſuppoſed to ſuffer in Purgatory, can no wayes be imagined Expiatory for what was done in the Body, as Papiſts themſelves in effect grant, (in denying that there is any Merit) and thereby yield their Purgatory a fantaſtical and inſignificant thing. Joh. 9. 4.

7. And laſtly, if there was ſuch a diſtreſs incident to the Souls of Believers after death, no doubt but God would have appointed ſomething for their relief; but no Sacrifice do we find under the Law that referres to the dead, or any one Office appointed or performed by any Ancient Saint under that diſpenſation, that can probably be applyed to ſuch a purpoſe; whereas every Minute caſe was reſpected, and from All uncleanneſs care was taken we might be purged; but the Dead, God ſeems willing ſhould be deſerted, not only by his paſſing them over, but charging us, as it were, to make as little adoe as may be about them, we *defile our* ſelves *by touching of them*, and are diſcharged thoſe pœnances that natural Superſtition had ingaged the Nations in, in reference to them: *Deut.* 14. 1. *You ſhall not cut your ſelves, nor make any baldneſs between your eyes for the dead*; and to the ſame purpoſe more fully, *Lev.* 19. 27, 28. This care we find taken to prevent much Ceremonie, ſuch eſpecially as carryed a ſhew of ſeverity, and ſeemed likelyeſt (according to the Popiſh Notion) to have profited the dead; but nothing in its ſtead does appear inſtituted for their relief; *which ſilence ſpeaks*, That perſons removed into the other world, are either happy above our Help, or miſerable beyond it: The Seventh day under the Law, was the day that perfected their cleanſing, and what was not clean then, we hear not when it ſhould be clean; by which probably was typified, that the time of Life was the time of Hope, and what was neglected in that term, was not to be repaired unto Eternity. Numb. 19. 12.

Thus much for Scriptural Arguments againſt this Doctrine of Purgatory.

But I foreſee a ſhrewd Cavil, which yet I am aſhamed to concern my ſelf about, it has ſo little in it; but on the ſame account I might have let all alone. Let us then hear it: Why,

Cavil. We have brought never a poſitive Scripture, that ſayes, There is no ſuch place as *Purgatory*; and an huge Out-cry is on ſuch Occaſions taken up againſt our *Negative* way of arguing againſt a Doctrine that they *poſitively profeſs*.

E. W. *Prot. without principles*, p. 459.

Anſ. 1. This old Father had ſaid ſomething, if he had told us, they had *poſitively proved* it; but *poſitive Profeſſion* without proof (methinks) ſhould not priviledge any one from anothers *as-poſitive Negation*, if I may ſo phraſe it. And truely on their part it lyes to have given us poſitive and expreſs Scripture for Purgatory, that would impoſe it on us as a poſitive Article of Faith to be believed on pain of Damnation, which how they have quitted themſelves in, may be obſerved in the obſcure and impertinent Allegations before inſtanced in.

2. It ſeems abundantly ſufficient for a *ſuſpenſion of Faith*, (which is our caſe,) that we ſee, and are able to ſhew, that there is *no* Foundation for it, which is that I think he calls our *Negative way of Arguing*.

3. It ſeems abſurd to provoke to poſitive expreſs Scripture againſt every particular Chimæra that may come into mens heads, a thouſand years after the Scriptures were writ; for ſo, if any man ſhould aſſert, (eſpecially if many ſhould agree to it) that *Mahomet* is a true Prophet, or that the Moon was a Milſtone, or whatever elſe can be ſuppoſed more unlikely; I am bound to ſubſcribe to it, except I can bring particular, poſitive, expreſs Scripture againſt it. It has alwayes been the prudence of Law-givers to direct their particular Laws againſt Faults in being, leſt in forbidding all that might be, they might teach ſome, that never elſe would have been; God has walked in the ſame wiſdom he infuſed into them, and it has ſufficed him particularly to condemn what was particularly practiſed againſt Faith and good Manners, leaving general Rules for the Tryal of after Emergencies. Yet,

4. In the Scriptures we have quoted, there is that poſitively aſſerted, that gives us good Foundation poſitively to conclude, that there is no ſuch place as *Purgatory*.

For if Chriſt has fully ſatisfied, and God fully pardoned, and gave hopes to his people, that on their departure hence, they ſhall be immediately glorified, (all which has been fully by poſitive Scriptures proved) we may poſitively conclude, that other Satisfactions are not required, the Saints ſhall not be ſo ſeverely puniſhed, nor their Expectations at that rate delayed, as in the Doctrine of *Purgatory* is aſſerted. And thus we have done with our *Doctrine poſitive*.

vil, Conſe-quences of the Doctrine of Purgatory.

(6) *What evil Conſequences are there of this Doctrine of Purgatory, where it is received, and whereon it ſhould not be received?*

I have forehinted ſome, which I ſhall briefly recapitulate, and adde a few others.

1. Hereby the Freeneſs of Gods Grace is diſparaged, and he is repreſented an hard Maſter to them that fear him, contrary to the Notion he has

has every where given them of himself, and his design of insinuating into the good Opinion of them, as one mainly tender over them: God would make them believe, that *he was afflicted in all their Afflictions*, and angry with them that layd an hard blow, or continued an heavy hand upon them, though it was but for seventy years. But in this Doctrine of *Purgatory* he is represented as of a far other temper; and that when men have done their worst with them, they shall not scape so, but he will have his pennyworths out of them, and a thousand years exquisite Torments shall not suffice some of them; which is to dash the good Opinion his Saints (on his Sons Report) had conceived of him. Zech. 1. 15.

2. Hereby the Fulness of Christs satisfaction is denyed, and Faith in him much discouraged. What confidence indeed can be put in him, if he should leave us thus in the lurch, and force us to seek other Friends, when we have most need of him.

3. Hereby the horrid Nature of Sin is lessened, in that any thing that we can suffer in a little time, or our Friends can doe over and above their own Duty, is reputed a just satisfaction for it, or any the least Remainders of it.

4. Hereon Humane works and helps are over advanced, and many a piece of Superstition and Will-worship introduced, and a pack of deceitfull Priests diverted from their proper work with the Living, and vainly occupyed about the Dead, that have no more a portion for ever in any thing that is done under the Sun. Eccl. 9. 6.

5. Hence Bad men are less carefull to prepare for Death, since a great part of their business may be done by other hands when they are gone.

6. Hereon Good men are e'en afraid to dye, for it seems a terrible thing to enter into this *Purgatory*, where especially their coming out depends so much on mans Sincerity, whom it is hard to trust when one is gone; and *his* Reward is come. They that know the difficulty of Believing in Christ, must needs be more streightened to place any comfortable confidence in a Priests prayers and Masses, that (if he be faithfull while he live,) lives not for ever to make Intercession, or make up his Satisfaction for him.

From all which I conclude,

That the Doctrine of Purgatory and Prayers for the Dead, as if thereby their afflicted, tormented Souls could be relieved, is a Corruption of lamentable consequence to the Church, and a pernitious snare to Souls. General Conclusion.

But since there is no such Thing as a Purgatory after this Life,

1. Let us purge and prepare our selves as much as we can in this Life, making use of Christs Blood, Spirit and Word to that purpose, and freely submitting to, and complying with present Afflictions in their design this way, considering, That *Christ gave himself for us, that he* Use.

might redeem us from all iniquity, and purifie unto himself a peculiar people zealous of good works. Let the fire of holy zeal burn in your breasts, since the Fire of an after-Purgatory, is not like to kindle on your persons.

2. Let this cut off all vain hopes after death from them that have neglected Salvation-work in life, considering that there is no relief for them hereafter, but to Hell God will immediately send them, *Psal.* 9. 17. *Consider this ye that forget God*, and unpreparedly expose your selves to his hand, for he will *tear you in pieces, and there shall be none to deliver you*; or yet further to speak to you in the *Psalmists* words, *Ps.* 49. 6,7,8. *They that trust in their wealth, and boast themselves in the multitude of their Riches, none of them can by any means redeem his Brother, nor give to God a Ransom for him; For the Redemption of their Soul is precious, and it ceaseth for ever.*

Psal. 50. 22.

3. Let this chase away needless Fears from good people at the point of Death, for when they have drunk that Cup, they shall taste no more bitter to all Eternity, *Sorrow and sighing shall fly away, and everlasting Joy shall be upon their heads.*

4. Let what has been said commend the Protestant Doctrine in *denying Purgatory*, as a usefull wholsome Doctrine, while we live, and alike comfortable to them that have lived well, and learn'd to rely on Christ, when they come to dye.

(7) Lastly, *let me give the genuine sence of this place, and improve it*, and this will force a more particular respect to the Context.

1. The Builders are generally understood, (in a way of Eminency at least) of the Doctors of the Church; though I will not contend, if any shall comprehend also their Disciples that shall *build* their Faith upon the Doctrine which they have delivered.

2. The Foundation that is built on by both Builders is supposed the same, *The Lord Jesus Christ*, such as own him, are as to the main Christian; they on all hands are yielded to broach *damnable doctrines* indeed, *that deny the Lord that bought them*, 2 *Pet.* 2. 1.

3. As to the Materials that are superstructed on this Foundation, though some of our Adversaries are contentious about them, and will (against all sence) suppose by Gold and Silver to be meant *good Works*, and by Hay and Stubble *Venial* sins, (which is a perversion of the very scope of the Text) yet hereabout we are pretty generally agreed, that at least *properly and firstly*, the Apostle speaks of Doctrines, and by *Gold, Silver, and precious Stones*, are meant a Superstructure suitable to, and worthy of the Foundation, *like precious Faith*, that in the whole Building there may be a proportion: And by Wood, Hay and Stubble, (as *A lapide* phrases it) we understand, *Doctrina incerta, frivola, pomposa, phalerata, curiosa, inutilis*; an uncertain, frivolous, pompous Doctrine, that has more shew than substance; that is of a base, earthy, rotten, moulding, perishing

In locum.

periſhing Nature, that is a blemiſh to the Foundation, and deſtroys the Uniformity of Chriſtian Religion; and makes a meer *Nebuchadnezzars* Image of it, part Gold, and part Clay; that can never cement or hold long together: And by theſe laſt Builders, or rather Dawbers, I underſtand eminently the *Popiſh* Doctors; Chriſt they ſeem content ſhould lye for the Foundation, though ſome will tell them, it is but a Nominal Chriſt that they lay there neither, for the ſtreſs of their Building is layd on other things, while they make uſe of his Name; and we muſt be beholding to our ſelves, and I know not what Saints, for our Salvation, though He bears the Title of *our Saviour*. Yet grant it, that they make Chriſt their Foundation, what incongruity is there between that and their ſuperſtruction? To inſtance:

Chriſt is *King*; this they pretend to own, a *golden foundation*: But They muſt raign. This in effect they inferre; a wooden, dirty, dungy Superſtruction. If you ask wherein they do ſo? I anſwer, (1) In diſpenſing with Chriſts Laws, which they do at pleaſure. (2) In making New Laws equally obliging Conſcience under pain of Damnation; this they have done with that Arrogance, that we may finde Ten of theirs to One of Chriſts, as will appear by comparing their Voluminous Decretals with his Goſpels, and his Servants Epiſtles. And laſtly, in taking upon them to Authorize as it were and inforce his Laws, as if they had their binding power, not ſo much from Chriſts Inſtitution, as the Popes Declaration: nor in this can they pretend Subſtitution, unleſs they could ſhew us his Commiſſion, walked by his Directions, or expreſſed more Subjection. That Scripture, in regard of the Popes Arrogance, both in reſpect of Chriſt and his People, may well be applyed (as undoubtedly it belongs) to him; that *as God, he ſitteth in the Temple of God, ſhewing himſelf that he is God*, 2 Theſſ. 2. 4. Pſal. 2. 6.

Agen, Chriſt is *Prophet*; a good Foundation: But we muſt ultimately hear and heed the Pope; a ſtrawy ſuperſtruction, and a perfect degrading of Chriſt by implication; ſee whether we bring againſt them a wrongfull accuſation: *Things are not to be believed becauſe Chriſt ſaid them, but becauſe the Church of Rome avouches them*; the very Scriptures themſelves, and every particular Article of Faith, according to them, have their Credibility, not from any character that Chriſt has put upon them, or Seal that he has ſet to them, but as the Church votes them, ſo we muſt believe of them: This is more notorious than that we ſhould need to bring in particular Authors of theirs; and what is the meaning of this, but while they give Chriſt the Name, to uſurp to themſelves the Office of inſtructing and inlightening the world; *it may be no Hereſie to disbelieve what Chriſt has ſaid*, as was fore-noted in the inſtance of Pope *John* 22th; but he that ſuſpends Faith to any thing, or dares think contrary to what the Pope (forſooth) and his Council have inſtamped with their Authority, he is an intolerable Heretick, and fit onely for Hell.

Once

Once more, They will not ſtand with us about Chriſts being *Prieſt*, wherein they ſeem to own the *Foundation*; but ſtreight joyn with him ſuch a frye of their *Sacrificuli*, as if they much doubted his ſufficiency: hence alſo we are taught by them to multiply Sacrifices as well as Prieſts, as if he had not by that one he offered, for ever perfected them that believe; we are put on perſonal Satisfactions, directed to others Interceſſions, all wayes are deviſed to affront him in this Office, while they pretend to own him. Heb. 10. 14.

And by what in theſe particulars has been inſtanced, is evidenced what it is to rear a ſtrawy Superſtruction on this golden Foundation, wherein the Papiſts of all men are notoriouſly guilty.

4. By the *Day* that ſhall declare every mans work, the Papiſts will have meant, as in their Tranſlation is read, *the Day of the Lord*; by which ſome of them underſtand the Day of the general Judgement; though others will admit a more particular Judgement, and with good Reaſon; for if good and bad works were not declared till the day of the univerſal Judgement, and the fiery Tribulation of that day, the Fire of Purgatory would go quite out, for there would be no place for that: But it is confeſſed on all hands, that the generality of *Greek* Copyes, read onely *the Day*, not *the Day of the Lord*; and that it is not ἐκείνην ἡ ἡμέρα, as that great Day is wont to be expreſſed, but onely, ἡ ἡμέρα; Therefore hereby I am inclined to underſtand ſome brighter ſeaſon of the Goſpel, and *day*, in reſpect of its Light, to diſtinguiſh it from the former times, which were a kind of Night, wherein thoſe Myſts had aroſe, that the Light and Heat of this Day ſhould ſcatter and chaſe; according as was foretold, 2 *Theſſ.* 2. 8. *That this wicked one ſhould be revealed, and that the Lord ſhould conſume him with the Spirit of his Mouth, and deſtroy him with the brightneſs of his coming*; which word we find has been regarded, and that *wicked one* and his Works (however by the advantage of former darkneſs he and they were concealed) have begun to be revealed, conſumed, and we hope, as the day grows brighter, to ſee utterly deſtroyed. For as the Day growes in Light, we may expect it to increaſe in Heat, that it ſhall be tormenting, through its violent ſcorching, to them that for their evil and odious works have alwayes affected darkneſs and ſhade, *Rev.* 16. 8, 9.

5. We are hereby lead further into the underſtanding of the Fire after mentioned, as a Concomitant of this day, wherein every mans work, that is, Words and Faith, ſhould be tryed, all adulterate works conſumed, and ſuch like workers damaged and greatly endangered; and this Fire I underſtand partly of the Word of God, which I find ſo expreſſed, *Jer.* 23. 29. *Is not my Word like Fire?* and ſo acting, *Jer.* 20. 9. *His Word in my heart was as a burning Fire, ſhut up in my Bones*; partly I underſtand it of the Spirit, that ſhall blow up this Word, and actuate it unto a greater vigour, making it to burn fiercer, as Bellowes doe inrage our ordinary fire, to which there ſeems an alluſion, *Iſa.* 30. 33. *the breath*

breath of the Lord like a ſtream of Brimſtone doth kindle it; and in regard of the inflamations that are made in the Heart by the Spirits enforcing the Word, it may be called a *Spirit of Burning*, *Iſa.* 4. 4. And yet further I conceive, great and grievous Tribulations may be a third ingredient of this fire, and all to make it yet fiercer and fiercer, that it may be effective for the various purpoſes for which it is ſent, probation, purgation, or conſumption, according to the plyableneſs or obſtinacy of the Objects it meets with.

When this fire ſhall be kindled, and at this rate quickened, true and falſe Doctrine ſhall be diſtinguiſhed, the one cleared, and the other condemned; and ſo each mans works manifeſted.

This premiſed, what remains is eaſily explained.

His Work may be ſaid to *abide*, whoſe Doctrine ſhall be approved, and *he ſhall receive a reward*; preſent, in the further ſatisfaction of mind he ſhall receive by the Spirits confirmation and conſolation of him, as to what he has preached, profeſſed, or believed; and future, in the peculiar Glory he may expect, as having found Grace to be faithfull in all times: This *John* exhorts the Elect Lady to look to, that both he and ſhe might *receive a full reward*, 2 *John* 8.

7. His Works are ſaid to be burnt, that yields to the burning Light of that day, that ſubmits to the Convictions of the Spirit, and quits his former Errours; ſo Chriſt is ſaid to *come to deſtroy the works of the Devil, by the manifeſtation of himſelf*, 1 *Joh.* 3. 8. That is, to burn them, as here, with the brightneſs of his coming; and ſo the Sons of *Levi* were purified; by his burning up their droſs, and leaving them thereby a pure maſs; it is, I'm ſure, no uncouth Notion we give you, when we interpret this burning of their works, by a purification that ſhall paſs upon the Builders, in *their* ſeparation and conſumption, through the Spirits efficacious and clear Conviction. But, Mal. 3. 2, 3.

8. *How is the Builder hereon ſaid to ſuffer loſs?* It may ſeem his Gain.

Anſ. Yea, and it will prove ſo, as Loſſes often doe, even as the Mariner accounts it, when by the loſs of his Lumber he ſaves his Treaſure, by the loſs of his Goods he ſaves his Ship, by the loſs of his Ship he ſaves his Life; But whatever he does gain, Loſs ſtill he is reckoned to ſuſtain. So in the preſent Caſe, he that on the Spirits Conviction quits his former Errours, gets the knowledge of the Truth, gets Favour with God, which are far better things than what he has parted with. Yet inaſmuch as theſe things might have been eaſier and cheaper had, than (it may be) he comes by them, and in that by a kind of force, as in a Fire or Shipwrack, to ſave himſelf he parts with them; they may bear the Name of a Loſs, as *Paul* reckons the parting with his Righteouſneſs, though it was in order to the winning of Chriſt, *Phil.* 3. 7, 8. *Thoſe things that were gain to me, I counted loſs, yea doubtleſs, I count all loſs, I have ſuffered the loſs of all things, &c.*

And

And in the preſent caſe, whenever theſe refuſe-works are burnt, we may reckon up ſome Loſs, as (may be) the loſs of Time, the loſs of Labour, the loſs of Reputation, the loſs of Preferment, the loſs of Life; ſo ſome have found in quitting their corrupt Opinions, but the promiſe is, *He that loſeth his Life for my Name, ſhall find it*, Matth. 10. 39.

9. From hence naturally reſults the interpretation of our Text, [*But he himſelf ſhall be ſaved, yet ſo as by Fire*,] that is, by yielding to theſe Convictions, and quitting his falſe Opinions, even as when a mans Houſe is on fire, if he leaves his Goods, leaps out of the Window, and haſtes away, he may ſave his own perſon with the loſs of the Reſt; but if he obſtinately reſiſt the fire, in zeal to ſave his Subſtance, he may periſh himſelf: In like manner, if when this Spiritual Fire do's fall from Heaven upon our ſpiritual Hay and Stubble, we ſuffer it to prey thereupon, and content our ſelves to eſcape with our own Lives, giving up theſe Idols of our Hearts, and inclining our ſelves to embrace Gods Revealed Truths, we may ſave our Souls with ſome little ſcorching. But if we go about to quench this Fire, and ſuppreſs its Light, with reſolution to ſave this pitifull ſtuff; we may poſſibly preſerve that, but more than *hazard* the everlaſting burning of our own Souls by it. *For the wrath of God is revealed from Heaven againſt all ungodlineſs and unrighteouſneſs of men, who hold the Truth in unrighteouſneſs; and to them that are contentious, and obey not the Truth, but obey Unrighteouſneſs, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguiſh* will God repay *on every Soul of them.* Rom. 1. 18.

And this I ſuppoſe is the genuine meaning of the place.

Obj. But our Adverſaries will be asking, What Pope, what Council ſayes ſo? by what Authority will we inforce their receiving of this ſence?

Anſ. To which I anſwer in two particulars:

1. I note the Commentaries of Popes and Councils, however good they be at it, are very rare things, and come not to every ones hands; one may gueſs them choyſe Jewels, that they keep them ſo cloſe; though they are a ſpightfull ſort of Folks, if they onely know the Mind of God, that they ſo rarely apply themſelves to open the Word of God.

2. I ſuppoſe there is *Authority* in the Text ſufficient to bow our Minds to read it with meekneſs, and without prejudice; and being confident of this, I am leſs ſolicitous for the *Authority* of the Comment. For in our giving the ſence of Scripture, we pretend not to have *dominion* over any ones Faith, that we ſhould come with Serjeants and Bailiffs to arreſt any ones conſent without his due conviction to it; but it ſuffices us to propoſe with Fidelity, what on our beſt ſearch and moſt ſerious prayer, ſeems likelyeſt to be the mind of God, and commend our ſelves and ſence to *every mans Conſcience in the ſight of God*; and he that hath an Eye to ſee, let him ſee; but he that will flutter out all the light that is brought

brought to him, becauſe it is not ſet on a Candle-ſtick that likes him, let him lie in darkneſs, if he affects it; but let him think of the blackneſs of darkneſs that may be reſerved for him, as a juſt puniſhment of his deſpight of Light. This has been thought a meet Recompence for ſuch Errour. *Sic. de dyp. & mund.*

Briefly then, as I promiſed, to improve this genuine ſence, Improvement.

1. By way of *Expoſition* of Proteſtants Charity, wherein Papiſts much glory: Even We, *ſay they*, hold that they *may* be ſaved; We doe; but obſerve in what Caſes: 1. In caſe of *invincible* Ignorance; and thus we hope well of many a devout Soul that dyed in their Communion, in the *night* of Popery, and had not Means or Opportunityes to know better; their walking in all known Duty, and Repenting even of unknown iniquity, might commend them to Gods infinite mercy; but ſtill this is onely our Charity, a Relyance on which, except we had better Judgements than they think we have, makes not for their ſafety. 2. In caſe of their Reformation in complyance with after-conviction; and thus we have like hope of *Turks* and *Pagans*, and this I am apt to think is almoſt generally expected, ſince the *day* of Goſpel Light has begun to dawn, and much more as it grows brighter and brighter, and its beams dart hotter and hotter upon their Conſciences: Let the Learned of them eſpecially look to it, for however it goe with the ſimpler ſort, that are ſo of Neceſſity, they will hardly eſcape, Perſons and Works too; but if they abide together, now the *day* of the Lord is begun, and his Fire goes forth, they are like to be burnt up, and periſh together. And it is not our Charity, nor (may be) Gods Mercy, that will relieve them, while Chriſts Merit, in deſpight of all the Convictions of his Spirit, is thus ſlighted by them.

2. By way of *Call* to ingenuous Papiſts, to cloſe with this way that is diſcovered for their Salvation, by quitting their ſtrawy and wooden Superſtructions, and giving up all their vain Inventions to their *firſt Conviction*; I would not have them prevent it, nor delay upon it; it is dangerous abiding in *Babylon*, *when it is day*, retaining the works of darkneſs, when it is light; when you do hear Gods Call, (and hearken for it) *Come out from amongſt them, leſt ye partake of their Plagues*: or to apply what was ſaid to *Lot*, *Gen.* 19. 17. *Eſcape for your life, look not behind you, neither ſtay in all the plain, eſcape to the Mountains, leſt you be conſumed.* Rev. 18. 4.

3. By way of *Caution* to unwary Proteſtants, that (may be) hold the Foundation; look alſo to the Superſtruction, take heed of ſtrange and uncouth Opinions, and when you have imbibed them, be not over-tenacious of them, but give them up ſtreight to Conviction, and ſtand not on the loſs of Reputation, the quitting them may be the onely means of thy Salvation. For though there may ſeem no great evil in thy Opinion, thy obſtinacy in adhering to it, when ſufficient Light is given to ſee the

folly of it, may in continuance become the Sin againſt the Holy Ghoſt, that will never be forgiven.

Concluſion. To conclude, I read, *Act.* 19. 19, 20. Of many *that had uſed curious Arts, which brought their Books together, and burnt them before all men, and they counted the price of them, and found it fifty thouſand pieces of Silver, ſo mightily grew the Word of God, and prevailed.* A remarkable inſtance indeed of the power of the Word: That Scholars ſhould be wrought on to burn their Books, their Books of curious Arts, that got them probably their Credit; their Books of ſuch a value. And the truth on't is, to accommodate our preſent caſe hereto; mens own Notions and Fancies are dear to them, when no outward advantage follows them, [*Qui velit ingenio cedere rarus erit,*] but much more when their Intereſts are twiſted with them: Yet methinks, their Souls ſhould be much more precious; and for their ſakes, I beſeech all concerned in the former charge of *fooliſh Builders*, that they caſt away their Idols of Silver and of Gold, to the Bats and to the Moles; and I beſeech God in the behalf of *Rome*, and all that partake with it in its unmeet and unworthy Superſtructions, though on the common Foundation; that on the warm Application of the Word, they may ſeparate from their *works*, leſt as the fire grows hotter, they be conſumed with them. A bleſſed Bonfire it would be, to ſee their Works all burning, and therein bleſſed, as it would tend to their Souls ſaving. But oh! my heart miſgives me; if Gods Word ſo far prevail for their Conviction, what means that crackling Noyſe I hear, of Fire and Brimſtone prepared for their Deſtruction? *Rev.* 17. 16. & *ch.* 18. *v.* 8.

Ceaſe frighting one another with your Purgatory flames, that are but imaginary; and fly the Fire of Gods Wrath, kindled at his Jealouſie, that is like to prey upon you unto all Eternity.

SER-

SERMON XXV.

The Visibility of the True Church.

Dr Samuel Lee

Matth. XVI. 18.

And I say also unto thee, that thou art Peter, *and upon this Rock I will build my Church, and the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it.*

OUR Blessed Lord being within the Territories of *Cæsarea Philippi* (neer *Lebanon* and the Fountains of *Jordan*, where *Philip* the Tetrarch of *Ituræa* and *Trachonitis* had his Royal Seat or Throne) was pleased to put two Questions to his Disciples; 1. Whom did men commonly suppose him to be? 2. Whom more especially did they judge and acknowledge him? To this demand, *Peter* in the (*a*) name of the rest (for our Lord propounded the question to them all) replies and confesses him to be the true *Messiah*, the Son of the living God.

(*a*) *Petrus ex persona omnium Apostolorum*, &c. Hieron. in loc. Tom. 9. p. 30.

Upon this glorious Confession, our Lord and Saviour,

1. Pronounces a heavenly blessing to *Peter*, *v.* 17.

2. Acquaints him and the rest present, that upon himself whom he had confessed to be the Son of the living God, not only *Peter*, but his whole Church should be firmly built, *v.* 18.

3. He makes a Promise to him and the rest, of Ministerial power, *v.* 19. which he performed unto all, when he breathed on them the Holy Ghost, *Joh.* 20. 22, 23.

In the 18th *verse*, besides the Preface [*And I say also unto thee,*] we have three principal parts.

I. *Encomium Petri*, or a Laudatory Testimony, bestowed upon *Peter*, and in him, upon all, of whom he had demanded answer; *Thou art*

Peter, &c. In which our Lord does not *now first* give him that Name, for that was done before, *Joh.* 1. 42. where our Lord told him, that thenceforth he should be called *Cephas* or *Peter* (which is by Interpretation a stone) as God of Old had declared concerning the name of *Abraham* and *Israel*; and as *Elizabeth* about the Name of her Son *John*. In this denomination of *Peter*, there is a manifest allusion to the following words, by an elegant *Paranomasia* or παρονομάσιας: Thou art *Peter*, whom I have formerly called by the name of a Stone, to note thy being built upon that Foundation-stone, that Rock of Ages whom the Father hath layd in *Zion*.

Gen. 17. 5. 32. 28. *Glass. Rhet. Tract. 2. Cap. 2.*

II. A Declaration of our Lord concerning his Church, which he compares to a House, Palace, or City, wherein observe,

1. The Foundation of this Building, *On this Rock*, representing him whom thou hast confess'd.

2. The Architect, *I will build.*

3. The Edifice, *My Church.* Not any particular Church exclusive to others; but the whole Church Catholick. This Text assigns no *diploma* or Priviledge to the Church of *Jerusalem*, *Antioch*, *Constantinople*, *Carthage*, or ancient *Rome*, or any other particular Church, otherwise than as parts and parcels of the whole Church; or as there may have been found in them, such as by lively Faith and sound Doctrine were built upon Christ, the onely true and living Rock, the sure and precious Foundation of his Church. As to the timeing of the Verb: I *will* build, *that* no way excludes the ancient Fathers before our Lords Incarnation, who all dyed in Faith, and without whom we are not made perfect; but notes the continuation of this divine work in building up the Church, till the Top-stone be laid in the end of the World, with Acclamations of Grace. It pre-signifies the enlargement of the Church among the *Gentiles*, by the Ministerial Edification of the Apostles, according to that famous Prophecy in *Zechary*, of the latter times, when they that are afar off, shall come and build in the Temple of the Lord, consonant to the tenor of the whole New Testament.

Heb. 11. 13. Vers. 40. Zech. 6. 12, 15.

III. The Perennity or Perpetuity of the Church. Our Lord addes a Promise as strong as the Foundation it self, for the Mouth of *the Lord* hath spoken it: That his Church shall be *monumentum ære perennius*, more durable than Heaven and Earth: for they shall pass away with great Noyse, the Elements melt, the Earth, and the works therein shall be burnt up: The Foundations of the Earthly Mountains may be set on fire: *Ætna*, *Vesuvius* and *Hecla* may vomit out their burning bowels. The Channels of the Sea may appear, and the inmost Caverns of the World be discovered; nay the foundations of Heaven may be moved, and shake, and its Pillars tremble, when God is wroth: But the Church of God shall persist and endure against all assaults, against all oppositions imaginable. For 'tis *his* Church, against whom all created power is but weakness, their machinations and contrivements a thousand times more

2 Pet. 3. 10. Deut. 32. 22. 2 Sam. 22. 7. Vers. 8. Is. 59. 5.

more frail than the most delicate and tender Web of a Spider. The waves that foam against this Rock, dash themselves in pieces, and (as the Prophet elegantly,) they are cut off as Foam upon the Water, as Bubbles (pufft up with swelling Pride aud Animosity against the Church) suddenly subside, and shrink into the bosome of their primitive water. The Gates of Hell shall never prevail against it. The glorious Building of the Church, assaulted it may be and shall be, but prevailed upon or demolisht, never. Like Mount *Zion* she shall never be moved; nay, she cannot be moved, for the Highest himself hath establish'd her, *there's* her *inward* stability: And as to the repelling of all *external* force and fury, *as the Mountains are round about Jerusalem, so the Lord is round about his people for ever.* The Church shall never be extirpated out of the World. The Rain may descend, the Floods rush, and the Winds roar and beat upon this House; but it stands inviolable against all weathers and storms, for it is founded upon the Rock. Enemies may fret awhile, fume and boyle in the brine of their own Anger, and (like Bodies molested with sharp and corrosive humours) become self-tormenters, at last are emacerated, wasted and dissolved. 'Tis Wisdom it self, having hewn out her seven Pillars hath built this House, truely deserving the honourable name of S. *Sophia*, (more than that magnificent Structure at *Constantinople*) the Temple of Sacred Wisdom.

Hos. 10. 7. Psal. 125. 1. Psal. 87. 5. Ps. 125. 2. Mat. 7. 25. Prov. 9. 1.

The farther Explication of the words may be referred to the handling of this Position or main point deducible out of the bowels of this Text:

That the Lord Jesus Christ, the Eternal Son of the living God, is the onely Foundation of his Church, and the preserver of its duration in some measure visibly throughout all Ages. *Observ.*

Wherein three things are to be discussed, in such a method as a Textual Sermon may admit.

1. We are to treat of the Church of Christ, what it is, and whereof it consists.

2. Of the Foundation of the Church, that it is Christ, and Christ onely.

3. Of the Duration and Continuance of the Church upon this glorious and strong Foundation, in some state of Visibility through all Ages. Though sometimes it may appear more conspicuous, and sometimes less. As the Sun may be sometimes Ecclipsed, and that totally to some places in the Terrestrial Globe, though in it self never extinguisht, nor its radiant beams wholly withdrawn from all parts of the Hemisphere at the precise time of the compleat interposure of the Moons body. Sometimes he may be mantled in a Sable Cloud, and that for many dayes together; sometimes he may have driven his Chariot to visit our *Antipodes*; sometimes his visible Diameter is larger, and sometimes lesser; sometimes he warms our Zenith, and sometimes comforts the Antartick Pole. Neither

is,

is the Queen of the Night a less fit resemblance, being much more variable in her Phases and Appearances. Such hath been the Fate of the Church of God: Now direfully Ecclipsed by bloody Persecutions, Then shining out the more illustriously; Now clouded with thick vails of Error and Heresie, Then vigorously conquering by the bright Rayes of Truth. Now dim and dusky by the thick Foggs and Mists of Superstitious Ceremonies, Then more beautifull and Orient in her naked simplicity, and Apostolical Lustre; being cloathed with the Sun, and a Crown of Twelve Stars upon her head.

Rev. 12. 1.

(1) As to the first, *What the Church of Christ is?* We find it here compared to a House, to a stately Palace, or Princes Mansion, or Castle of Defence, built upon an impregnable Rock: Nay, 'tis the House of the Living God, typed by that ancient sumptuous Temple of *Solomon*. Sometimes 'tis resembled to a City, to the City of *David*, founded and built upon the renowned Mountain of *Zion*, which shadowes forth both its Duration and Visibility. But the Metaphor, as a Vail or a Glass, being laid aside; as under the Notion of a quick Rock, we contemplate the onely begotten Son of the Living God, so by the Regular and well-polish'd Materials of the super-imposed building, we are to understand the lively Stones mentioned in *Peter*, which coming to him by Faith, are built up into a Spiritual House. Such as compose the Structure of the Church are the adopted Children of God. The learned of the Reformed Churches have a little varied in Expressions, but agree in the Substance. That the Church of God is a company of Holy Persons, chosen of God from Eternity, in Christ, unto Eternal Life. The Church consists of Men, not of Angels, and therefore must be Visible: They are Holy ones, not Hypocrites or profane persons, who may sometimes thrust into the Communion of the External Visible Church. They are such, who in Gods due time are called out of the World, by the Ministry of the Word, and the inward Efficacious Grace of his Spirit. Let's summe up these particulars in that Declaration which the Church of *England* hath exhibited to us †.

1 Tim. 3. 15.
1 King. 6. 1.
Isa. 2. 1.
Mic. 4. 1.
Ps. 46. 1.
48. 5.
87. 3.
Rev. 21. 2.
1 Pet. 2. 5.

† *Homilies* of the Church of *England*, in the 2d part of the Sermon for *Whit-Sunday*.

[" The true Church is an Universal Congregation or Fellowship of " Gods faithfull and Elect people, built upon the Foundation of the Apo- " stles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the Head corner-Stone.

" And it hath alwayes three Notes or Marks, whereby it is known: " Pure and Sound Doctrine; the Sacraments ministred according " to Christs Holy Institution; and the right use of Ecclesiastical Disci- " pline.]

Upon the particular Branches of this Description, I must not enlarge, onely acquaint you at present, that I shall here treat of some peculiar points, referring to that true real Church of Christ whereof our Lord speaks in this Text: Such, as being founded upon him by Faith, cemented to him by Love, worships him in Spirit and Truth; against which all the Powers of Darkness shall never prevail; but shall continue successively

2 Thess. 2. 13.
Act. 26. 18.
Joh. 4. 24.

ceſſively throughout all Ages here upon Earth; ſometimes ſhining more clearly, otherwhiles more obſcurely, yet alwayes in ſome meaſure *viſible* and diſcernible by the marks of true Doctrine, Worſhip and Diſcipline; and at length ſhall be wholly tranſlated to Eternal Communion with Chriſt their moſt glorious head in the higheſt Heavens.

(2) As to the Foundation of this Church, we aſſert that Jeſus Chriſt is the Rock, the ſolid and onely Foundation whereupon 'tis built, which may be demonſtrated, 1. *Negatively* or *Excluſively* as to all others. 2. *Poſitively* as to Chriſt himſelf.

1. *Excluſively.* No other is, or can be admitted for the Rock or Foundation of the Church. ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ On *this* ſingle, individual Rock will I build my Church. No other can communicate in this high and ſupereminent Honour.

Obj. But ſome may ſay, Does not the Pronoun in the Text relate moſt properly to the next Antecedent, *Peter*; and not to *Chriſt*. Is it not more genuine?

Anſ. 1. This Grammaticiſme will not conclude. For, 1. 'Tis commonly otherwiſe in many other places of Scripture, as *Gen.* 10. 12. *Joh.* 8. 44. *Heb.* 12. 17. *Act.* 19. 5. and particularly, *Mat.* 26. 26. If in that Enunciation [*This is my Body,*] *This* ſhould be referred to *bread*, the immediate Antecedent, then (as the learned obſerve) there's an end of their Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation: If they will preſs ſuch a Grammatical Nicety upon that as upon this Text. But 2dly, Though the Name of *Peter* be found neereſt in words, yet 'tis alſo obſerved, that the Perſon of Chriſt in moſt proper ſence and relation ſtands higheſt to the Rock upon whom *Peter* was built, and who had received that Denomination from his Confeſſion of the true and living Rock, the Son of God, *the* Chriſt, *v.* 20. *Glaſſ. Gram. Sacr. l. 3. Tract. 2. Can.* 10.

A. 2. But laying aſide that Grammatical conteſt, let's ſhew, That *Peter* was not, could not be the Rock whereon the Church is built.

For, 1. *Peter* was but a Man. Now no meer man can ſuſtain the wrath of an infinite God, or Redeem the Church by his Blood. The Apoſtle determines him to be God, who hath *purchaſed* the Church by his own blood; and the Author to the *Hebrews* declares, that the ſame Perſon who had by himſelf purged our ſins, is *ſet down on the right hand of the Majeſty on high*; the ſame to whom the Father ſpeaks, *Thy throne O God is for ever and ever*, that *High-prieſt who is entred within the Vail*; that *Son of God, who is paſſed into the Heavens.* Such a one *became us, who is made higher than the Heavens.* Chriſt the Head of the Church, who *is alſo the Saviour of his Body*, and gave himſelf for it; *who loved us, and waſhed us from our ſins in his Blood.* Act. 20. 28. Heb. 1. 3. Verſe 8. Chap. 6. 19. Ch. 4. 14. Ch. 7. 26. Eph. 5. 23, 25. Rev. 1. 5.

2. *Peter* was a Frail mortal man. But God had his Church, and *that* built upon this Rock, before ever *Peter* was born, and continued after his Death and Funeral. God the Father had laid this Foundation, מרסד מרסד, *Fundamentum fundatum*, this ſtrong Foundation, long before Iſa. 28. 16.

before *Esay*'s time; which the *Chaldee* Paraphrase Glosses thus: [מַלְכָּא מַלְכָּא תַּקִּיף גִּבָּר וְאַמְתָן, *the King, the Powerfull King, the strong and terrible.*] And *Rabbi Solomon* expressely, *The King Messiah, that* he *may be in Zion a Stone of Munition and strength,*] as *Petrus Galatinus* recites out of him and others of the Rabbins. The Prophets of Old, as well as the Apostles, built upon this Foundation. Besides, when *Peter* came upon the Stage, he goes off again; and when *Peter* dyes, must the Church perish? The Foundation being gone, the Building must needs tumble, neither does our Lord any where speak of, or promise to any Successors so great a Priviledge to step into his room, to lye in the Foundation, and to be the supposed *Atlas* of his Church; and were it so, then *Peter* personal must be dismiss'd.

Galatin. l. 3. c. 21. Eph. 2. 20.

3. *Peter* was a *sinfull* man, and that by his own Confession, [*Depart from me, for I am a sinfull man, O Lord*] and this was acknowledg'd, after that our Lord had called him by the name of *Peter*. Nay more than so, *Peter* erred in Faith about the Death and Resurrection of Christ, and our Lord rebuked him sharply, as being under a tentation of Satan; nay, he thrice denyed our Lord. But because some would apply the Promise in the Text, to a Performance after the Resurrection, the Holy Scripture (as if on purpose to obviate these futilous Objections) sets it down that even *then* he did not ὀρθοποδεῖν, not walk uprightly in the Gospel, and *Paul* withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed. Shall we then think, that the Church was founded upon a sinfull man? since such a High-priest becomes the Church, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners; a Lamb without blemish and spot.

Luke 5. 8. Mat. 16. 22, 23. Mat. 26. 75. Gal. 2. 14. Verse 11. Heb. 7. 26. 1 Pet. 1. 19.

4. *Peter* determines the Point himself, and expounds the Prophecy in *Esay* of Christ, and he himself doctrinally layes down Christ for the true and onely Foundation in the *Zion* of the Church; disallowed indeed by *Pharisees* and the proud builders of *Babel*, but approved of God, and solemnly preach'd by *Peter* at *Jerusalem*, and unanimously attested by all the Apostles, and recognized for the onely true Foundation of the Church. Will any then, that so admire and adore *Peter* for their own ends, yet dare to gainsay him to the face, and force him into the Foundation, so flatly against himself?

1 Pet. 2. 4 5. 6, 7. Act. 2. 22. Vers. 14. Ch. 4. 11, 12.

5. *Peter* as meer *Peter*, could never victoriously grapple with the Assaults of Satan; he had been finally and fatally foiled, had not Christ prayed, had not this Rock sustained him. The Church must have a Foundation against which all the Gates of Hell can never prevail, and which infuses Vertue and invincible consistency into the Building it self; as if a quick and living Rock should inspire and breathe into the stones of a Palace fixt upon it, some of those Mineral Eradiations wherewith it self is endued, to preserve it from mouldering and turning into dust. The Church must have a vital and quickening Foundation, that it may not only stand against impetuous windes, but be a growing Temple, and increase

Eph. 2. 21.

creaſe with the Increaſe of God. The Church hath ſuch potent, ſubtle, and furious Enemies, that ſhe needs ſtrength from the mighty God of *Jacob*, the Shepherd, *the Stone of Iſrael*; one that is ſtronger than that infernal ſtrong man armed; a Lion of the Tribe of *Judah*, that can tear that Lion of Hell in pieces. Col. 2. 19. Gen. 49. 24. Luk. 11. 21, 22. Rev. 5. 5.

Since then *Peter* was but a *meer* man, a frail, *mortal* man, a *ſinfull* man, weak and *impotent* to reſiſt the Powers of Darkneſs, and one that abſolutely *rejects* any ſuch honour from himſelf or any other, as abhorring ſuch derogation from the Glory of his and our moſt bleſſed Saviour; let's inferre that [*this Rock*] in the Text, can in no wiſe be meant of *Peter*, or any other of the Apoſtles. And that this was the ſence of the ancient Church, I might abundantly prove; let it ſuffice to recite but two or three teſtimonies.

Chryſoſtom on this Text, *Upon this Rock*, expounds it τετέστι τῇ πίστει τῆς ὁμολογίας on the Faith of Confeſſion, *i. e.* upon Chriſt, in whom thou believeſt, and whom thou haſt confeſſed. And let *Chryſoſtom* explain himſelf: [ἐπὶ εἶπεν ἐπὶ τῷ Πέτρῳ, ἔστε γὰρ ὅτι τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, ἀλλ' ὅτι τὴν πίστιν τὴν ἑαυτὸς ἐκκλησίαν ᾠκοδόμησε *He ſaid not upon* Peter, *for he did not build his Church upon a Man, but upon the Faith of himſelf.*] *Chryſoſtom*, Tom. 4. p. 344. Edit. Eton. *Id. in* Homil. 1. in Petrec. ſt. Tom 8. p 979.

In like manner *Ambroſe*, or his Contemporary, upon the 2d of the *Epheſians*, citing this Text, [*Super iſtam Petram, hoc eſt, in hâc Catholicæ Fidei Confeſſione ſtatuo fideles ad vitam.*] *Upon this Rock*, that is, upon this Confeſſion of the Catholick Faith, do I fix, *ſettle or build* Believers unto Salvation. But of all, none more clear than *Auſtin*, in his Sermons upon *Matthew*; [*Super hanc Petram quam confeſſus es*, i. e. *ſuper meipſum Filium Dei vivi, &c. ſuper Me ædificabo Te, non Me ſuper Te, &c.*] Upon this Rock whom thou haſt confeſſed, *i.* upon my ſelf the Son of the Living God, *&c.* I will build Thee upon Me, not Me upon Thee. Again, in his 124th Treatiſe on *John*, [*Super hanc Petram quam confeſſus es, &c. Petra erat Chriſtus ſuper quod fundamentum etiam ipſe ædificatus eſt Petrus.*] Upon this Rock which thou haſt confeſſed, *&c.* the Rock was Chriſt, upon which Foundation even *Peter* himſelf was built. Again, in his 10th Treatiſe upon the Epiſtle of *John*, [*Super hanc Petram, &c. ſuper hanc fidem, ſuper id quod dictum eſt, Tu es Chriſtus Filius Dei vivi, &c.*] Upon this Rock, *&c.* upon this Faith, upon that which had been ſpoken of (*i. e.* by *Peter*) thou art Chriſt the Son of the Living God. So that when *Auſtin* or other of the Fathers explain this Rock, by this Faith, or this Confeſſion, we ſee they underſtood it Objectively of our bleſſed Lord, the Son of God. Many more might be cited, but I haſten. *Ambroſ.* in c. 2. *Epheſ.* p. 1998. Edit. Par. 1569. *Auguſtin* in Matth Serm. 13. Tom. 10. p. 58. Edit. Baſ. 1569. Id. Tract. 124. in Joh. Evang. Tom. 9. p. 572. Id. Tract. 10. in Epiſt. Johan. Tom. 9. p. 649. So *Sixt.* 2. in Decret. *Gratian.* cauſ. 24. q. 1. c. 10. col. 1835.

Obj. Some have replyed, That though *Peter* be not the main, principal and eſſential Foundation of the Church, yet he may be admitted as a Secondary, a Vicarian, a Miniſterial Foundation, without detriment to the Honour of Chriſt.

A. 1. I anſwer, this Secondary Foundation, is an abſurd diſtinction,

and contrary to the very Nature of a Foundation. Whatever is laid upon
Vitruv. l. 1. c. 3. & 5. & l. 3. c. 3. the Foundation, is a Superstructure or part of the Building. *Vitruvius*, the grand Master of *Roman* Architecture, taught his *Romanists* no such fond language, when he mentions Foundations in three several places; nor *Barbarus* upon him, nor *Palladius*. Let's pass then from Artificial to the Metaphorical or Spiritual Buildings, for whose support Scripture supplies us with no such Additions, or Coagmentations with the main Foundation. If any should urge out of *Paul*, that the *Ephesians* were
Eph. 2. 20. built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets; it must be understood of a Doctrinal foundation, not an Essential: for Christ himself is expressely *there* termed the *Corner-stone*, the λίθος ἀκρογωνιαῖος, the grand Massie stone, that fills up the whole *area*, and reaches to all four
Verse 21. Corners, on whom *solely all* the Building, πᾶσα, the *whole* Building is fitly framed together. The Apostles indeed did *lay* this foundation and
1 Cor. 3. 11. no other, and the *Ephesian* Saints were built upon this foundation of the Apostles, *i. e.* which the Apostles did lay, and so 'tis call'd *their* foundation, *architectonicè*, or by a Metonymie. They preaching the Doctrine of Faith in Christ, did lay down for the sole Rock this great and fundamental point (though rejected of the *Jewish* Builders) that there is
Act. 4. 12. no *other Name given under Heaven among men, whereby we must be saved.*

2. Again, This their secondary Foundation, (which we say is Doctrinal onely) must be co-extended to all the Apostles and Prophets, by the Plumb-line of the same Text; and therefore their laying of *Peter* for the onely foundation, though but Secondary, will sink as in the Moorish ground by *Tyber*, and will prove no single foundation at all; for all the other Apostles are joynt-heirs of the same preheminence. Holy *Paul*, (speaking of such a Doctrinal foundation,) sayes, that he preach'd the
Rom. 15. 20. Gospel where Christ was not named, lest he should build on another mans foundation.

3. Hence it appears, that the preaching of the Gospel of Christ, is all the Foundation that the Apostle pretends to, *viz.* to a Doctrinal laying of Christ, as the true foundation of his Church. *Paul* was but a workman, a Labourer dexterously handling his Evangelical Instruments, and
1 Cor. 15. 10, 11, 12. *Peter* was no other: Nay, *Paul* testifies, that he laboured abundantly, more than they all, in laying this foundation, and building upon it: for *so* (sayes he) we preach'd, and *so* ye believed. *No other Foundation can*
1 Cor. 3. 11. *any man lay*; he speaks it ῥητῶς & ἀνεπιφυλάκτως, both expressely and exclusively, πλὴν τοῦ κειμένου, *praeter quod jactum vel positum est.* No other
Chrys. in 1 *Cor.* 3. Tom. 3. p. 297. *besides* it. Μηδὲν ἔξω μέσον ἡμῶν καὶ Χριστοῦ, None between us and Christ, as *Chrysostom* glosses it, and proceeds; ἂν γὰρ γένηται μέσον, ἐυθέως ἀπολλύμεθα· ἐὰν τὸ μικρότατον. If any thing interpose between us and Christ, though in the least, we perish presently.

4. Again, If *Peter* had been any such Secondary Foundation, surely
Gal. 1. 12. *Paul*, who received the Gospel by the Revelation of *Jesus Christ*, would,

nay,

nay, *must* have excepted him from the rest of the Apostles, or at least have conjoyned him with *Christ*, and have laid single *Peter* next and immediately upon him. But this is *Vatican* Doctrine, and to be found no where but in the fained Acts or Revelation of *Paul*, which *Gelasius* condemned for Apocryphal.

To conclude then, since our blessed Lord and Head of the Church hath declared no Vicegerent, being a Spiritual King, the Son of the Living God, who searches the Hearts and Reins, and is Omnipresent by his Divinity, and promised to be with his Church in all Ages, by vertue of his Spirit; He needs no Vice-Roy, has instituted or appointed none; and *Peter* exercised and performed no such Office; but calls himself συμπρεσβύτερος, (as 'tis in the *Greek*) a *Fellow-presbyter*, with such as feed the *Flock* of *Christ*; since *Paul* and *John* make all the Apostles equal in Preaching, and laying down this *Foundation*, the Doctrine of *Faith* in *Christ*, the Son of the Living God: Let us then fairly lay *Peter* aside, without any diminution to his Apostolical Honour, which we greatly reverence, and look upon him as perfectly equal (*pari consortio*, as *Cyprian* speaks) with the rest of the holy Apostles, and let us with all Adoration and Joy, behold *Him*, (whose Shooe-latchet *Peter* was not worthy to loose,) as laid by the *Father* in *Zion*, and firmly believe in him as the Son of the living God, whom *Peter* confess'd to be the Rock, and preach'd him up in the face of the Elders of *Israel*, for the onely *Foundation* of the Church.

Rev. 2. 23. Mat. 28. 20. 1 Pet. 5. 1. Rev. 21. 14. P. 163. *Edit. Bas.* 153. Cypr. *de Simpl. Prill.* *Marsil. Patav. defens. Pacis*, part. 2. c. 16. p. 198. Act. 4. 10, 11.

If *Peter* then be not the Essential and Personal *Foundation* of the Church, (which were Blasphemy to assert;) if the Secondary *Foundation* be a Nullity, Then down falls all the pretended Successors of *Peter*, whether at *Cæsarea* in *Palestine*, or *Antioch* in *Syria*, or any of the Cities of *Pontus* and *lesser Asia*; much more their wooden Seat at *Rome* (as *Baronius* shapes it) *A.* 45. *n.* 11. as the furthest, so the weakest pretenders to succeed the Apostle of the *Circumcision*. Nay although it were granted that he were at *Rome*, which some Learned men stiffly deny; though he might suffer at *Rome*, which others out of *Jerom* and *Lyra* insinuate to be a misinformation, and that he was crucified by the *Jews*; These things impair not our cause, since *Peter* had no more power than any other of the Apostles, and therefore could transmit no more to his supposed Successors. For 'tis a stated Rule in their own Canon-Law, *Nemo plus juris in alium transfert, quam sibi competit*; None can transferre that to another, which he hath not himself: And that other for a Successor, *Is qui in jus succedit alterius, eo jure, quo ille, uti debebit.* He that succeeds in anothers Right, must content himself with the Right of his Predecessor.

Gal. 2. 7, 8. *Reg. juris* 79. *in* 6. *Decretal. l.* 5. *Reg.* 46.

II. *Positively.* That *Christ* our holy and blessed Redeemer, is the onely True and Real *Foundation* and Rock of the Church. *Other foundation can no man lay, than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ.* He is that Elect and *precious Corner-stone*, on which all true Builders doe

1 Cor. 3. 11. Eph. 2. 20.

ædifie the Church of God. Being rooted and built up in him, and stablish-
Col. 2. 7. ed in the Faith. To this, the Apostle *Peter* brings in his clear evidence,
Isa. 28. 16. *To whom*, as the *Foundation laid* of God, *ye coming as living stones, are*
1 Pet. 2. *built up a spiritual House*. Parallel to this of a *Foundation*, is that other Metaphor of a Head, taken from the Natural Body; In which respect
Rom. 12. 5. Christ is every where declared to be this glorious Head of the Church.
1 Cor. 12. 27. *He is the head of the Church, and Saviour of the Body.* As the Head is
Eph. 1. 23. strictly conjoyned to the living Body; so between Christ and the Church
4. 15. there is a Sacred and intimate Union. As the Head by the several con-
5. 23. Col. 1. 18, 24. jugations of the Nerves, propagated from the Brain and spinal Marrow,
2. 19. derives those curious volatile and vital influences, for the actuating of the several senses, and for the Rule and Government of the whole Body
Heb. 5. 14. in all its motions: So doth Christ vivifie and quicken the spiritual senses, instruct, guide and govern every member of his spiritual Body the Church. To confirm this a little, and pass to the third branch of the Text.

1. *God* the Father *gave* Christ to be head over all to the Church, and
Eph. 1. 21, 22. exalted Him far above all Principalities, and hath put all things under
Isa. 28. 16. His feet. God *laid* Him in *Zion* for a *Foundation*, and no other: The
Psal. 48. 8. Church is the City of God, and he hath *establish'd* it for ever. It's built
Ps. 87. 1, 5. upon *his* Foundation in the holy Mountains, and the *Highest* himself will
Psal. 118. 22, 23. establish her. The head-stone of the corner fixt in *Zion* is of the *Lords doing*. And as the *Foundation*, so the whole Ædifice of the Church is
1 Cor. 3. 9. οἰκοδομὴ θεοῦ, the *building of God.*

2. *Christ* in the Text builds his Church upon no other than himself, ἐπὶ ταύτῃ, *on this Rock will I build my Church*; and *Christ* being the Son
Heb. 3. 3. of God, is more Honourable than *Moses*, because *he builds* this House of the Church.

3. The *Spirit* of God *fits* no other for a Habitation of God, but This
Eph. 2. 22. Church built upon This Foundation; he increases no other with divine
Col. 2. 19. and heavenly growth but This.

4. Such a Foundation must be *laid*, against which the gates of Hell shall never prevail; but Christ onely is such a Foundation. Because he
Joh. 14. 19. lives, the Church lives also. No meer man can perform this function. *Peter* falls not finally, because Christ prayes prevalently; *Paul* stands
2 Cor. 12. 9. stoutly against the buffets of Satan in the Sufficiency of Christs Grace and Power. And all the Saints are victorious and triumphant, and more
Rom. 8. 37. than conquerours through him who loveth them, and sing that ἐπινίκιον, in his Name, and wave the Imperial Standard, the flag of Triumph, like that of *Constantine*, *Sub hoc vinces*; in the Sacred words of *Paul*,
1 Cor. 15. 57. *Thanks be to God, who giveth us the Victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.* Since then *God* the *Father* hath laid no other Foundation, and *Christ* builds upon no other, and the *Spirit* Influences and quickens no other; since no other can support and defend the Church: Let's pronounce them blessed whom God hath joyned, and let none dare to impose or conjoyn another, at their Eternal peril. 'Tis an Idol-founda-

tion

tion of their foolish brains; our glorious Lord will not give his Honour to another.

(3.) We are now in view of the Third and last Branch of the Text; The *Duration of the Church of Christ*, in some state of Visibility throughout all Ages; fortified by the Promise of Christ, that the Gates of Hell shall be successeless in their Attempts against it.

The Church as it is built on Christ, as far as it cohæres and sticks close to this Foundation, by that virtue communicated to it from the intimate connexion with, and union to Christ, can never be dissolved and perish. Neither can external adverse Power demolish it, or secret Subtlety undermine it, so as to render it altogether invisible; and therefore it must and shall so persist, throughout all Ages.

We have here three parts considerable,

1. The Churches Opposites; πυλαι Ἅδου *The Gates of Hell*, or of Death and Hell. I shall not dwell upon the Niceties of these terms: Let it suffice, that they signifie the infernal Powers of Darkness, and all that are animated or inspired by them with subtle counsels, and irritated into cruel Machinations, and warlike Agitations against the Church. Not onely open Persecutors, but cunning Hereticks do build the Gates of Hell, and discharge their Artillery against the City of God. As *Origen* spake of *Marcion*, *Basilides*, and *Valentinus*, those ancient Hereticks, Ἅδου πύλας ᾠκοδόμησαν, that they built several Gates in the City of *Babylon*; so may we say of *Nero*, *Trajan*, and *Diocletian*, the ancient Persecutors, they mounted their battering Rammes, and managed the *ballistæ fulminales*, they shot their enraged Arrowes against the Church of God, and their followers have been no less sedulous, though as unsuccessefull to this very day. *Origen* in Matth. gr. lat. Edit. 1668. p. 277.

2. The *grandia Molimina*, their great Undertakings They shall put forth all their strength and policy; whatever the Lion and Serpent can entwine together; what a cunning *Julian* could contrive, or a fierce *Maximinus* execute against the Church; whatever the wit, malice and power of Earth and Hell, could with most inflamed rage either enterprize or atchieve, hath been carryed on to the utmost, but all in vain. They imagine a vain thing against the Lord and his Anointed. The Church like her glorious Head shall never see corruption, though all the puissance of the adverse City march into the Field against her. The *Egyptian City of Destruction* (to allude to that in *Esay*) shall attempt, but all shall prove ineffectual, for the Name of this City is *Jehovah-Shammah*, *the Lord is there*. The Church hath been assaulted *vi & arte*, by open force and secret fraud; but *no Weapon formed against Zion* shall finally prosper. Psal. 2. 1, 2. Isa. 19. 18. Ezek. 48. 35. Isa. 54. 17.

3. The *Churches Duration*; she must and shall continue till all the Enemies Arrowes are spent, their courage daunted, and their City ruined and laid in ashes. For the Lord will miserably destroy those wicked men, and our blessed Saviour proves it out of the 118th *Psalm.* Mat. 21. 41, 42. Psal. 118. 22.

For

For the Stone which the Builders refused, is become the head of the corner. Whosoever falls upon *this* stone shall be broken, and on whomsoever *it* falls, it shall grinde him to powder. This is that burdensome stone in *Zechary*. This is the Stone with Seven Eyes engraven upon it; The Stone cut out of the Mountain, that shall fill the whole Earth.

Zech. 12. 3. 3. 9. Dan. 2. 34, 35.

For the handling this Third part of the Position, the *Churches Duration* in all Ages, it's necessary to know this Church by those Notes and τεκμηρια that have appeared as notable Characters of the true Church in all Ages, against which the Gates of Hell have set their principal Batteries, and thereby to evidence and prove its continual *Duration* and *Visibility*.

Since then, the Church is built upon Christ, the Rock of Ages; since Christ is the onely Head and Bridegroom of the Church, he the onely chief Shepherd, and since that which makes the intimate Union between Christ and the Church, is Faith wrought in the Hearts of all the true members by the Spirit of Christ: This may be one Note:

Note 1. 1. *That wherever this Doctrine of Justification by Faith in Christ has been maintain'd and sincerely defended*, there *hath been visibly the True Church of Christ*. And it might be amply evinced, that this Heavenly Doctrine hath been conserved in all Ages, against all the furious Assaults of its Enemies.

Note 2. 2. *Since Jesus Christ, the onely Head of the Church, is her glorious Lord, the Son of the Living God, he ought to be worshipt by her. He is thy Lord, and worship thou him*; and this Worship must be performed in Spirit and Truth. But here, because all the three persons in the Divine Essence, are one God, I shall consider this Worship, as terminated Objectively in God Essential; and since that this most Holy and Glorious God, abhorres Idolatry, and worshipping of him by Idols, Images, Pictures, or any other Symbol to represent him, or by which, (as helps to Devotion) to accend and inflame the Heart in Worship; this may be set down as another Note of the true Church, which keeps the Commandments of God in point of Worship mentioned before, *v.* 9. And indeed, in respect to worshipping of God by Images, consists the very Essence and Formality of the Second Commandment. The First being *de Objecto cultus*; That God is the true and onely Object of Religious Worship, the Second is, *de modo & mediis cultûs*: That God who is exceeding Jealous of his own Glory, detests and abhorres to be worship'd by the Intervention of Idols, and to present any Adoration before them, though men may excuse it, and profess that God is the ultimate term of their Worship. But these things I must leave to be more amply insisted upon by such whose peculiar Province it is to handle them more distinctly: But so far 'tis necessary here to use and improve them as critical *marks and notes* of the true Church; the one in point of Doctrine the other in point of Worship. The true Church of Christ hath in all times according to the holy Scriptures, born a Testimony to these two gran

Psal. 45. 11. Joh. 4. 23. 5. 23. 12. 26. Rev. 14. 12.

point

points, and I shall endeavour to prove it as to both. There be other points, I confess, and very material, whereby this Truth might be exemplified, but I chose these as Cardinal.

I. For the Point of *Justification by Faith.*

This particular is best worded in Scripture Language, to which all must adhere. Though mens sentiments may vary in the Explication, yet I think it most fit to lay it down in the words of holy *Paul*, indited by the Spirit of God.

That a man is justified by Faith, without the Works of the Law: They have no Ingrediency into our Justification before God. If they had, it were not *by Grace*, and if by Grace, then it is no more of Works; and this Work of free Grace proceeds on to Salvation it self. *For by Grace are ye saved through Faith, and that not of your selves, it is the Gift of God. Not of Works, lest any man should boast. Not by Works of Righteousness which we have done*, &c. Being justified *by his Grace.* That which the Apostle had set down *privatively* before, here he sets it down *negatively*, as in that to the *Galatians. A man is not justified by the Works of the Law, but by the Faith of Jesus Christ*, &c. Now whereas their Cardinal *and others*, would have *Paul* to exclude the Works of the Ceremonial Law, not the Works of the Moral Law, or the Gospel; that cannot stand; for then we should still be justified by Works: But the Apostle puts Works and Faith in a Diametrical Opposition; and after that he himself was in a Regenerate Estate, desired to be found *in Christ*, not having *his own Righteousness*, which *is of the Law, but that which is through the Faith of Christ, the Righteousness which is of God by Faith*; and that though he were conscious of nothing by himself, yet herein he was not justified. Yea that Works done with Faith, *Ex Ratione Operum*, upon the account of Works, do not justifie, as the Apostle amplifies it in the case of *Abraham*; no nor Faith it self as a Work, but as it apprehends the Lord Jesus Christ, and yet the Apostle charges *Titus* to *affirm constantly, that they which believe in God, must be carefull to maintain good Works, for these things are good and profitable to men.* They are necessary to Salvation, though they have not a formal Ingrediency into our Justification. The holy Apostle professes, that by this Faith in the Son of God he did live, and in this Faith he would dye; desiring to be found in no other at the appearing of Christ. This was the ancient Faith of the Primitive Apostolical Church of Christ, and the *good Old Way* of the ancient *Roman.* On this Rock Christ hath built his Church, *&c.* on himself by Faith. This is *Articulus stantis atque cadentis Ecclesiæ*, The grand Article, which being maintained, the Church flourishes; being rejected, she perishes.

Rom. 3. 28. Rom. 11. 6. Eph. 2. 8, 9. Tit. 3. 5, 7. Gal. 2. 16. *Bell. de. Justif.* l. 1. c. 25. Phil. 3. 9. 1 Cor. 4. 4. *Rivet Controv. Tract.* 4. q. 10. p. 265. Rom. 4. 3. 22. Tit. 3. 8. Gal. 2. 20. Phil. 3. 9, &c. *Luth.*

I might here, out of every Age of the Church since our Lord, produce clear Evidences for this Doctrine of *Paul*, dictated by the Spirit of God. I might shew its preservation by the ancient Fathers, and how attested by some of the Councels; by whom it may appear in what

Coun-

Countries this Apostolical Doctrine was taught and embraced. By *Hillary* in *France*, *Ambrose* in *Lombardy*, *Chrysostom* in *Syria* and *Thrace*, *Jerom* in *Palestine*, *Austin* in *Africa*, *Basil* in *lesser Asia*, and many more. But not to swell the Discourse too largely, I shall onely exhibit two or three Testimonies in distant Ages, of *Clement*, *Ambrose* or his Contemporary, and *Bernard*; after whom this Truth glittered forth in the Confessions of the *Waldenses*, in the Doctrine of *Wickliffe*, and shined forth most gloriously more and more till the great Reformation appeared.

Sculteti Annal. p. 11.

Let's begin with *Clement*, who was σύγχρονος, &c. contemporary with *Peter* and *Paul*, (as *Epiphanius* accounts in his Discourse of the Heresie of the *Carpocrasians*). He in his first Epistle to the *Corinthians*, speaks distertly to this point, [ἐ δι' ἑαυτῶν δικαιόμεθα οὐδὲ διὰ τ ἡμετέρας σοφίας, ἢ συνέσεως, ἢ εὐσεβείας, ἢ ἔργων, ὧν κατειργασάμεθα ἐν ὁσιότητι καρδίας, ἀλλὰ διὰ τ πίστεως δι' ἧς πάντας τὸς ἀπ' αἰῶνος ὁ παντοκράτωρ θεὸς ἐδικαίωσεν. ᾧ ἔστω δόξα εἰς τὸς αἰῶνας τ αἰώνων. Αμὴν.] *We are not justified by our selves*, nor *by our Wisdom, Understanding, Piety, or* Works *which we have wrought in Holiness of Heart*; but by Faith, *by which God Omnipotent hath justified all from the beginning* (*of the World*;) *unto whom be Glory for ever and ever. Amen.*

Epiphanii panar. l. 1. T. 2. p. 107. Vol. 1. Edit. Petav. 1622.

Clem. ad *Corinth.* 1 Edit. Jun. p. 41 *Oxon.* 1633.

Let *Ambrose* succeed, who flourish'd at *Millane*, or whoever was Author of those Commentaries, he was coæval to *Damasus*, and was much of the same Age with *Ambrose*; *Bellarmin* judges him to be, *Hilar. Diac. de Script. Eccl.* p. 98. And he declares this expressely on that Text, *Being justified freely by his Grace: Quia nihil Operantes, nec vicem reddentes, solâ fide justificati sunt, dono Dei.* They are said to be *freely* justified, because working nothing, nor rendring any Duty or Service, are justified by *Faith alone*; it is *the gift of God*. And this *by Faith alone*, he four times repeats in his Exposition upon the fourth Chapter. Nay *Gratian* in the third part of the *Decretum* cites him thus. *Gratia Dei in Baptismate non requirit gemitum, non planctum vel opus aliquod, sed* solam fidem, *& omnia gratis condonat.* The Grace of God in Baptism requires not Mourning or Lamentation, or any work but *Faith alone*, and he freely forgives all. Where the new Gloss indeed set forth by *Greg.* 13. sayes, that *Gratian* took this citation out of the Ordinary Gloss, not out of *Ambrose* himself, whose words on the 11th to the *Romans* are, *Nisi solam ex corde professionem*, Except a Profession onely from the Heart. Which is true; but it seems hereby, that both *Strabus* the Author of the Gloss, and *Gratian*, took the mind of *Ambrose* more clearly than these new Glossators. For before, *Ambrose* speaks of the *Jews*, their returning to Faith, and after uses these words, *Hoc decrevit ut* solam fidem *poneret per quam omnia peccata abolerentur. God decreed this, that he might appoint Faith alone, through which all sins might be abolished.* So that now we have *Ambrose* and *Strabus*, and their own *Gratian*, all agreeing in this Doctrine of Faith alone. Here, though these

Rom. 3. 24.

Ambrose Edit. *Paris.* 1569. col. 1819.

Gratian. Decr. part 3. dist. 4. *de Consecr. c.* 95. Edit. *Romæ*, col. 2635. whereby we see *Ambrose* was anciently taken to be the Author of the Commentary.

Ambr. in *Rom.* c. 11 col. 1862.

Trithem. de Script. Eccles. f. 56. b.

these Commentaries by some are not judg'd to be genuine to *Ambrose*, yet since they are cited by *Strabus*, and the Synod of *Paris*, *A.* 825. *pag.* 655. and *Gratian*, and urg'd by *Romanists* in their own Cause, they ought not to reject them. For 'tis a Rule in the Canon-Law, *Quod pro se quis inducit*, &c. What testimony any bring for themselves, they ought not to reject when brought against them, *Dist.* 19. *c. si Romanorum.* However we may put *Hillary* in his room, *in Can.* 8. *in Matth.* expressely. *Fides sola justificat*, That Faith alone justifies, *Ed. Basil.* 1523. *p.* 355.

The next shall be the Testimony of *Bernard*, of *France*, who dyed in the year 1153. who expresses himself thus: *Tam validus ad justificandum, quam multus ad ignoscendum. Quamobrem quisquis pro peccatis compunctus esurit & sitit justitiam, credat in te qui justificas impium, & solam justificatus per* fidem *pacem habebit ad Deum.* "He is as pow- "erfull to justifie as to multiply pardon. Wherefore, whoever being "under compunction for his Sins, hungers and thirsts after Righteous- "ness, let him believe in thee who justifiest the ungodly, and being justi- "fied *by Faith alone*, he shall have peace with God. And then he proceeds to exhort to Holiness by eying and following of Christ. And otherwhere, *Credens* solâ fide *hominem posse salvari, cum desiderio percipiendi Sacramentum*, &c. *Si mors anticipet*, &c. "Believing that a "man can be saved *by Faith alone*, with a desire of receiving the Sacra- "ment, *&c.* If Death should prevent, *&c.*

Bern. in Cantic. Sect. 22. f. 130. b.

Isa. 55. 7.

Epist. 77. f. 194. a.

I shall not expend more time with further Allegations of the Ancients, or any particular discussion of these, or of that famous Canon of the Council of *Carthage*, or that other of *Orange*, *c.* 5. & 6. under *Leo* 1. neither shall I recite the Testimony of learned † *Bradwardine*, or the ancient Confessions of Faith set forth by the *Waldenses*. I might shew that this Doctrine hath been held by the faithfull, in all Ages, consonant to the Holy Scriptures: Unto which the Church of *England* hath given a full and ample Attestation, both in her Articles and Homilies: "Who- "ever preaches contrary to these Articles is to be excommunicated, *Canones* 1571. *Tit. Concionatores*, p. 20. Which are the Test and Touchstone of the Soundness of the Members of this Church. Of *the Justification of Man*, the 11th Article: "We are accompted Righte- "ous before God, *onely* for the Merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus "Christ, by *Faith*, and not for our own Works or Deservings. Where- "fore that we are justified by *Faith onely*, is a most wholsome Doctrine, "and very full of comfort; as more largely is expressed in the Homily "of Justification. If we look then into the Homilies, we finde, that after this Doctrine is asserted, and proved by Scriptures, and several of the Fathers; it's added, "This saying, that we be justified by *Faith one-* "*ly*, freely and without works, as being unable to deserve our Justifica- "tion at Gods hands, *&c.* and therefore wholly to ascribe the Merit and "Deserving of our Justification unto Christ *onely*, and his most precious

An. 418. *Justel. li Cod. Can. Eccl. Afric.* p. 293.

† *De Causâ Dei*, l. 1. c. 43. p. 392.

Canon. 36, 46, 51. *An.* 1604.

Article 11. compos'd 1562. and printed 1571. p. 8.

Book of *Homilies* in the second part of the Sermon of Salvation, *E.* ij. 4to. 1563 & in fol. 1635. p. 16.

"blood-shedding. This Faith, the Holy Scripture teacheth: This is the "strong Rock and *Foundation* of Christian Religion. This Doctrine "*all* old and *ancient Auctors* of Christs Church do approve: This Do- "ctrine advanceth and setteth forth the true glory of Christ, and beateth "down the vain glory of man. This, *whosoever* denyeth, is not to be "compted for a *Christian-man*, not for a setter forth of Christs Glory, "but for an *adversary* to Christ and his Gospel, and for a setter forth of "Mans vain-glory. Blessed be God for this excellent Sermon of the Church of *England*, which all good Christians doe *ex animo* reverence and embrace. To which a person of great Note may well be admitted to bring in a Gloss or Comment. *As for such as hold with the Church of* Rome, *that we cannot be saved by Christ alone, without Works; they do not onely by a circle of Consequence, but directly deny the Foundation of Faith; they hold it not, no not so much as by a Thred.* And again: *That* Faith alone *justifieth, by this speech we never meant to exclude either Hope or Charity from being alwayes joyn'd, as inseparable Mates with Faith* in the Man *that is justified; or Works from being added as necessary Dutyes required at the hands of every justified man; but to shew that* Faith *is the* onely *hand which putteth on Christ to Justification.* Which agrees with that known saying: *Fides sola* justificat, sed *non solitaria.* Faith stands alone in the Work of Justification, but is alwayes attended with the sanctifying Fruits and Effects of the Spirit of God. And thus *Austin* reconciles *Paul* and *James. August. lib. de diversis quæstionibus, col.* 599. *Tom.* 4. 1569. *Bas.*

Hooker in Discourse of Justification, *p.* 500. at the end of his *Polity.* 1622. *P.* 513.

Now to conclude: What sayes the *Convention* at *Trent* (as *Henry* 2d of *France* term'd it) to this Scriptural and Apostolical Doctrine of the Reformed Churches. Truely, they proceed no higher, than *to curse* such as say, men are *Formally* justified by the Righteousness of Christ, *i. e.* Essentially, purely, and exclusively; which they explain in the very next *Canon*, and curse them again, who shall say, that men are justified by the *sole imputation* of Christs Righteousness, *&c.* And they curse them again *Can.* 12. that shall say, that *justifying Faith* is nothing else, than a trusting of the Divine Mercy, forgiving sins for Christs sake, *&c.* Nay, they tell us, "It becomes the Divine Clemency not to forgive "us our sins, without any Satisfaction; *i. e.* of Ours. To which they annex a cursing Canon against such as affirm, "That the whole Penalty "is alwayes remitted of God together with the Sin, and that there is no "other Satisfaction of Penitents (required) than Faith, by which they "apprehend Christ to have satisfied for them. By these and the foresaid Testimonies, all may see what is the Doctrine of Holy Scripture, of the Primitive times, and the succeeding Ages of the Church, (which might be abundantly amplified in Testimonies,) and what is the Doctrine of the Reformed Churches, and of ours in particular, and what is the Doctrine of the *Romanists*; how opposite, how contradictory. But let us descend to a second inquiry, and that is about a great point of Worship.

Hist. Conc. Trid. l. 4. *p.* 369.

Sess. 6. *Can.* 10. 11.

Sess. 14. c. 8.

Ib. Can. 12.

II. Con-

II. Concerning the *Worship of God by Images.*

Let us now shew, that the Church of God, consonant to the Holy Scriptures, hath in all Ages given notable testimonies against Idolatry, and the Worship of Images, or of God by Images, as being flatly against the Second Commandment. As *Faith* is that Bond and Ligament which unites the true Church and every living Member thereof, to Christ their Head; so pure Worship is the Honour, and Reverence, and Obedience which the Spouse of Christ renders to her Lord and Husband, who will not communicate his Glory to graven Images. *Idolatry* is compared to *Whoredom* in Scripture, that dissolves the knot of Marriage. God sent a Bill of Divorce for this cause to the ancient external Church of the *Jews*, and expressely upon this account denounces against her, that *she was not his Wife*; and will God (think you) spare any particular Gentile Church, guilty of so fearfull a Crime; having annexed that high Argument of his Jealousie, against such as violate the Second Commandment, and reputing them as haters of him, and whom he will judicially visit with great detestation? Isa. 42. 8. Isa. 50. 1. Jer. 3. 8. Hos. 2. 2.

For the Exhibition of this point, how the true Church of God hath in all Ages held close to the Institutions of chaste and holy Worship, in Spirit and Truth: I might transcribe testimonies out of all the Ancients, that were the Luminaries and Columns of the Primitive Church, down along till *Gregory* the Great, and after his time also many notable and pregnant instances through the very depth of Popery, both of Emperours and Church-men, that did stoutly resist that growing Abomination in the world. I shall, (to avoid prolixity) mention some of the Councils that have determined against this point, and draw to an Issue.

That of *Elvira* neer *Granada* in *Spain*, celebrated *An.* 305. (as *Baronius* thinks) is peremptory in the case, and I shall desire to cite it out of *Agobardus*, because of that his ancient testimony about the year 830. to the truth of this Canon, which runs thus: *Ab orthodoxis patribus definitum est Picturas in Ecclesiâ fieri non debere, nec quod colitur & adoratur in parietibus depingatur.* "It is enjoyned by the Orthodox Fathers, "that Pictures ought not to be in a Church, nor let that be painted on "the Walls, which is to be worshipt and adored. It were vain to spend time, to shew how *Albaspinæus* and others, shift and shuffle about this Canon. Let that good old Bishop of *Lyons*, *Agobardus*, living so many hundred years nearer the time, give his sence upon it: "Let's keep "the Kings High-way; the Apostles, the Masters (or Teachers) of the "Church, they have taught it, *&c.* Let God be adored, worshipt, reve- "renced; let us sacrifice to him alone, either in the Sacrament of the "Body and Blood, or of a contrite Heart, *&c.* Let's look upon a Picture "as a Picture, without Life, Sense and Reason. So likewise, if we see "winged Angels painted, or the Apostles preaching, or the Martyrs "suffering torments, we can hope for no help, *&c.* Wherefore, to avoid "this Superstition, the Orthodox Fathers, did rightly determine, *&c.*] *Concil. Eliberti-num, Can.* 36. & 41. *Baron. An.* 305. n. 39. &c. *Agobard. opera, Par.* 1605. p. 254. P. 251, 252. P. 253.

Ivo. Carnot. decret. l. 3. c. 40. *Louan.* 1561. *Sixt. Sen. Bibl.* l. 5. *Annot.* 247. *Burchard.* l. 3. c. 35. p. 85. b. *Agobard*, p. 254.

in the Canon aforesaid. The very same is extant in *Ivo*, onely *ne* put for *nec*, and so 'tis read in *Sixtus Senensis* and *Burchardus*: And that *Agobardus* understood this Canon aright, against any Religious Worship to be given to Pictures and Images, he further addes: "Neither "let their deceitfull craftiness run to their old starting holes, to say, that "they do not worship the Images of the Saints, but the Saints themselves, "(*i. e.* by the Images) for God cries out, *I will not give my glory to* "*another, nor my praise to graven Images*, &c. Nay further, so strict were the good Fathers of that Synod aforesaid, that they would not suffer any Idols in their Houses. To conclude, the Authenticalness of this Synod must not be question'd, since several of its Decrees are recited by *Gratian*, whose whole work is confirmed by *Eugenius* the 3d, and by others succeeding, canoniz'd for Church-Law, and the Government of Ecclesiastical Courts.

As *Trithemius* affirms, *de Script. Eccles.* p. 73. a. and finally by *Greg.* 13. in his *Roman* Edition.

But let their confirmation be how it will, it is a notable testimony against them, even in that Age; and however *Sixtus Senensis* and *Albaspinæus* would evade, as if it were decreed against the Heathens Images and Pictures, as in the 11th Canon of the 12th Council of *Toledo*, that's but a weak shift: for, was it ever known, that the Christians brought the Pictures or Statues of the Heathen Gods into their Churches? No, no; the Fear was of a New kind of Imagery, and of Worshipping of God, and our Lord, and Saints, and Angels, by Representations and Pictures; which at length obtained dreadfully, to the high dishonour of God, contempt of his Commandements, the ruine of the Eastern Empire, and fearfull Judgements on the Western.

‖ *Hoveden Annal.* p. 232. b. *Edit. Lond.* 1596. and *Simeon Dunelm.* col. 111. *Lond.* 1652.

† *Rainold. de Idol. Eccles. Rom.*

Usher. Answer to the Challenge in *Ireland.*

Mede. Apostacy of the latter times.

Dailly de Imaginibus.

Homilies of the Church of *Engl.* against *the peril of Idolatry.*

It were too long to trace, what direfull stirres and commotions were in the East, about the time of the Second Council of *Nice*, and what excellent testimony was given against it by the Council of *Frankeford*, and the four Books of the Emperour *Charles* the Great, the Synod, *Genetil. ac Parisiens.* &c. and by the Church of *England*, in an Epistle written to *Charles* by *Alcuinus*, in the Name of the Princes and Bishops of our Land, execrating that Idolatry, as ‖ *Hoveden* and *Simeon* of *Durham* testifie: But notwithstanding all Opposition, how it prevailed in every Age, till at last it was finally ratified at *Trent*, and what eminent witness hath been all along raised up by God against it; these things being matter of Fact and Story, would rise to a just Treatise, and many things relating to it, being amply handled by † *Reynolds*, *Usher*, *Mede*, and *Dailly*, *&c.* famous in their Generations, who have skilfully handled the Sword taken from behind the Ephod. I shall come to a close of this Paragraph, onely recommend to your diligent Reading, those excellent Homilies of the Church of *England*, against the *Peril of Idolatry*; which if well read and digested, I hope by divine blessing may prove a Sovereign Antidote against the creeping Cancer of *Romish Idolatry*. But I suppose this will be the Subject of a compleat Position among these Exercises, and therefore at present shall enlarge no further. And now let us

hasten

haſten to ſome Inferences or Concluſions flowing from this Text and Point, of *Chriſt* being the onely *Foundation* of his Church, enduring throughout all Ages, united to him by their moſt holy *Faith*, and adhering to him by holy and pure *Worſhip*.

I. From what has been hitherto treated of, we may learn which is the *true Church of Chriſt*, and where it hath ſubſiſted and been preſerved in all Ages, and how to diſcern and know it, and the true Members thereto belonging, *viz.* By its being built upon *Chriſt* alone, the firm Rock and Baſis of its Conſtitution. Such are to be owned for Living Members, who acknowledge Chriſt, the Son of the Living God, to be the true and onely Head of the Church; ſuch as are built upon Chriſt, and the Doctrine of the holy Apoſtles and Prophets; Such as adhere to the Scriptures, and receive and refuſe things as they are proved or rejected by Scripture: to whom both *Peter*, and *Paul*, and *James*, and all the Apoſtles writings are equally precious: that dare not advance Humane Traditions, into a parity of Honour with the Divine Writings of Scripture, dictated by the Spirit of God; which teaches by what Notes and Characters to diſcern the true Church of God: (Not like thoſe abominable Wretches, who finding *Paul* ſo directly level'd againſt them, thought of cenſuring his Epiſtle as favouring of Hereſie, and the Author for a hot-headed perſon:) That tremble at ſuch Devices, and dare not try the Church by glorious and pompous Viſibility, Univerſality, and continual ſucceſſion of Biſhops in one place; looking upon them as falſe and counterfeit Notes: But by pure Scripture Doctrine, by Sacraments rightly adminiſtred, by Adherence to Chriſt alone for Righteouſneſs and Juſtification in the ſight of God, by Spiritual and Scriptural Worſhip, and ſuch like. We deny not, but firmly hold, that the true Church of Chriſt hath been alwayes *in ſome meaſure* Viſible. *Viſibilis, licet non omnibus viſa.* Capable of being ſeen and known by ſuch whoſe Eyes are anoynted by Scripture Eye-ſalve. Indeed if that were true which we find in the *Roman* Catechiſme ſet forth by the Authority of *Trent*, concerning that Article in the Creed about the Church: Præcipuè *in hoc articulo, Eccleſia bonorum ſimul & malorum multitudinem*, &c. *ſignificat*. That *the Church* in this Article doth *principally* ſignifie the multitude both of good and evil: Then indeed there might be ſome tolerable Plea for the Splendor and Perſpicuity of the Church in moſt Ages. But when we conſider the ſharp Perſecutions raiſed againſt the Apoſtles and the Primitive Church by the *Jews*, and againſt their Succeſſors by the *Gentile Pagan* Empire, ſo fierce and terrible, that *Diocleſian* doubted not to erect Columns of Triumph over Chriſtianity, among the *Arevacæ* in *Spain*; which ſome take to be remembred in *Arevacco* neer *Madrid*, with theſe Inſcriptions, *Nomine Chriſtianorum deleto*; and in another, *Superſtitione Chriſti ubique deletâ. ſc.* The Name of Chriſt being extinct, and the Superſtition of Chriſt being every where aboliſht: Or when

1 *Corollary.*

Eph. 2. 20.

Sir Edw. Sands Survey of the Religion in the Weſt, p. 116. *Edit. Lond.* 1637.

Catechiſm. Rom. p. 79. *Ant.* 1591.

Occones Numiſm. 40. *ad Heracl. Ant.* 1579.

when we reflect upon the Ἀριομανία, the Violence of the *Arians* against the sincere Embracers of the holy Doctrine of *Peter*, That *Christ was the Eternal Son of the Living God*, and so notably determined by the first Council of *Nice*: Or when we call to mind the astonishing Tragedies, acted by the *Papal* Power for about 1200 years, against such as have kept close to the same Apostolical Faith and Purity of Worship; We may well take up the *Threnodia*, or Lamentations of the Apostle, concerning the Church under the *Syrian* Princes: *They wandred about in Sheep-skins, and Goat-skins*, &c. *of whom the world was not worthy*; *They wandred in Desarts and Mountains, in Dens and Caves of the Earth.* True is that of *Hillary*; That the Church did meet with the Apostles, *intra cœnacula & secreta*, in chambers and secret places: Who afterwards sighing out his complaints against the *Arians*; *Male Ecclesiam Dei in Tectis Ædificiisque reveramini*: You do ill to reverence the Church of God in stately Buildings, *&c. Montes mihi & Sylvæ & Lacus sunt tutiores*: I count the Mountains, Woods and Marshes to be more safe: And as the Gloss cites him, *Potiùs in Cavernis Ecclesiam delitescere, quàm in primariis sedibus eminere.* That the Church is rather to be found lying hid in secret Caverns, than to be eminently conspicuous in principal Sees.

Heb. 11. 37.

Hilarius contr. Auxentium, p. 282.

P. 286.

Gloss.

But not to heap up witnesses; the testimony of the Church of *England*, in that notable Homily against the *Peril of Idolatry*, may suffice once for all, out of *Eusebius* and *Austin*. "That when Christian Religion was most pure, and indeed *golden*, Christians had but low and "poor *Conventicles*, and simple Oratories, and Caves under ground "called *cryptæ*; where they (for fear of Persecution) assembled secretly "together. And so it hath continued more or less during the Papal Dominion, according to the Prophecy, That *the Woman*, i. e. the *Church*, should recede into a Wilderness-state for 1260 years from the taking up of *Constantine* into Heaven.

Homily, part 3. p. 72. *b.* 4^rc.

Rev. 12. 6, 14.

The true Church of Christ, consisting of all its Members, (the greater part whereof is Triumphant in Heaven, and the rest Militant upon Earth, on which account onely is it to be genuinely called *Catholick*) cannot properly be styled *Visible* to the Eye of *Sense*, but (according to our ancient Creed) to the Eye of *Faith*. We believe there is such a Church, all whose true Members are certainly and onely known to God. For what Eagle-sighted Angel can search the Heart, and positively determine the truth of Faith in that sealed Fountain, whereby the Heart flowes out in streams of Love unto Christ? Against such a Soul, against a Society composed of such heavenly Members, against such a Church, the Gates of Hell shall never prevail. But against a catholick, external, visibly glorious Church, the Gates of Hell have so far prevailed in many Ages, that she hath been reduced into a very low and gloomy Estate; as she was in the Vision of *Zechary*, when the Man riding upon a red Horse, stood still among the Myrtle-trees that were in the bottome, by night.

Bp. of *Cov.* & *Lich. Grand Imposture*, p. 9.

2 Tim. 2. 19.

Zech. 1. 8.

Our

Our Lord promises the Churches Existency, and its perennial Duration, throughout all Ages, and his own presence among his Myrtle-trees, in a dark bottome, and his walking among his golden Candle-sticks in the deep Night of Adversity, but not its Glory and and Perspicuity; not Triple Crowns, and Eminencies. *Peter* never came forth shining with precious Stones, and glistering in Silks, and overlaid with Gold, and prancing on a white Palfry, guarded with *Switzers*, and hemm'd in with a crowd and Noyse of Servants; as *Bernard* accosts *Eugenius* the 4th, telling him, In these he succeeded the Imperial *Constantine*, and not *Peter*. Our Lord never promised such Glory and Splendor; those fine things become another kind of Creature in the *Revelations*. *Bern. de Conf. ad Eug. l. 4. f. 142. b.* Rev. 18. 16.

The true Church hath usually been as indigent of Silver and Gold as the true *Peter*; yet hath been preserved in all Ages from Extremity and Ruine. Some particular Churches, some members of the true and invisible catholick Church, whereof Christ is the Head, have been alwayes marching along the howling Wilderness of this World toward *Canaan*. The Church hath been mostwhile in a troublous and desert Estate, few *Elims* of Palm-trees to sit under, or Fountains in which to wash her sacred Eyes; yet as to Purity of Worship, and the Food of Heavenly *Manna*, she hath alwayes enjoy'd some *Moses's*, some Pastors to feed her in the Wilderness, such as have Prophesied to her all along. Her Faith in Christ, and chaste Love to him, hath been clearly discerned by none but his holy Eye; especially in times of general defection from the Truths of God, when as to her secret Communion in Ordinances, none but such whose Eyes are clarified in the Chrystal streams of holy Scripture, have been able to discern her. But there have been some few times, when very *Balaams* having climbed up into the Mountain of Contemplation, and stood upon a Prophetical Rock, and looking toward *this* Wilderness, have cried out in an Extasie, upon a sight of the glorious beauty of the Church, *How goodly are thy Tents, O Jacob, and thy Tabernacles, O Israel! as Gardens by the Rivers side, as the Trees of Lign-aloes, which the Lord hath planted, as Cedar-trees besides the Waters.* The Church hath been alwayes visible *in se*; God hath left no Age without a witness of the pure Word dispens'd, of the two Sacraments duely administred, and of Spiritual Worship and Order managed in a comely Apostolical manner, without the garish dresses of Humane Fancies, and Institutions; which are the onely proper Notes, Marks and Characters, where the true Church hath been and is, and where the faithfull Pastors are to be found, who stand in the *Counsel of God*. But who can help, if blind men cry out, they see her not; or such as want the Optick-glass of Scriptures, and call for a gay, splendid, sensual Appearance of glittering and costly Ceremonies? whose Ears fill'd with Temple Musick, their Eyes ravish'd with stately Pictures and *Babylonian* Images pourtrayed with Vermilion, and their Nostrils perfumed with the rich Odours of *Arabia*, cry out *Templum Domini, The Temple of the Lord is here*. Act. 3. 6. Rev. 12. 6. 11. 3. Numb. 24. 1. 5, 6. Jer. 23. 22. Ezek. 23. 14.

Was

Was not *Nebuchadnezzars* Image dedicated with great glory, set off with Consorts of Musick, and attended with numerous Worshippers? Alas, this universal consent, grand Acclamations, copious Assemblies, uninterrupted Successions in mitred Habits, Splendour, and Pomp, and Grandeur, are not the tokens of his Kingdom which cometh not with Observation, or as *Agrippa* and *Bernice*, μετὰ πολλῆς φαντασίας, with stately and splendid Presence. *Heathenisme* and *Turcisme* may plead for a Suffrage in such cases. Christs Flock is a *little* Flock; *In this World ye shall have tribulation*, sayes our Lord; and in *many tribulations we must enter into the Kingdom of God.*

Luk. 17. 20. Act. 25. 23. Luk. 12. 32. Joh. 16. 33. Act. 14. 22.

Now here I might, out of several ancient Records and Monuments, shew the Succession of some parts of the true Church of Christ in *France*, in the *Alpine* Valleys, and in *Britain*, and elsewhere in the East; where true Doctrine, (and for the main, true Discipline and Worship) hath been preserved all along, though secretly for the most part, and not with External Glory and Splendor: But that would infringe upon the dispatch of the remaining Corollaries.

2 *Corollary.* II. This Text, and Doctrine thence deduced, discovers all *false pretending Churches*, from the *true*: such as lay any other Foundation than Christ the Son of God; such as *hold not the Head*; such as build not upon the Doctrinal Foundation of the holy Apostles and Prophets, cannot be true Churches of Christ. Let good *Hilary* be Judge; *Quisquis Christum*, qualis *ab Apostolis est prædicatus, negavit, Antichristus est.* He is the Antichrist whoever denies Christ, *qualis* such as he is preached by the Apostles. Then such as are departed from the Doctrine of the Apostles in Fundamental Points, are counted by *Hilary*, Antichristian Societies. To him we may adjoyn holy *Austin*: *Mendax est Antichristus, qui ore profitetur Jesum esse Christum, & factis negat. Opera loquuntur, & verba requirimus? Ideo mendax quia aliud loquitur, aliud agit. Quis enim malus non benè vult loqui?* Antichrist is a Lyar, who professes Jesus to be the Christ with his mouth, and denies him in deeds. therefore a Lyar, becaus he speaks one thing and does another. The Works speak, and do we require Words? For what evil man will not speak well. And again: *Quære ab Arianis, Eunomianis, Macedonianis, confitentur Jesum Christum in carne venisse*, &c. *Quid ergo facimus? unde discernimus*, &c? *Nec nos negamus, nec illi negant*, &c. *invenimus factis negare:* Ask of *Arians*, *Eunomians*, *Macedonians*; they confess Jesus Christ to be come in the flesh, *&c.* what shall we do then? how shall we discern him? neither we nor they deny it; we finde that they deny him in deeds: As the Apostle saith of such, *They profess to know God, but in works they deny him. Quæramus in factis, non in linguis.* Let's seek it in their works, and not in their tongues. If we examine their Creeds, they profess to believe all the Articles, and more too; but yet in all his three Offices they evacuate the truth of their pretended Credence, as the ‖ learned have abundantly evinced: Which being

Col. 2. 19.

Hilar. contr. Auxent. p. 282.

August. in Ep. Joh. Tract. 3. *Tom.* 9. p. 598.

Id. Tract. 6. p. 623.

Tit. 1. 16.

‖ *Rainolds, Whitaker, Sharp, Crakanthorp, Wotton*, &c.

true,

true, then their own rule in the Canon-Law condemns them: *Certum est quod is committit in legem, qui legis verba complectens, contra legis nititur voluntatem:* It's certain, that he trespasses against the Law, who embracing the words of the Law, practises against the mind of the Law. For by their *traditions* they have made the *commandments* of God of none effect. So true is that which *Ambrose*, or some Ancient under his name, thunders against such; *Quicquid non ab Apostolis traditum est, sceleribus plenum est:* Whatever is not delivered by the Apostles, is full of wickednesses. But before we enter the particulars of this Enquiry, we must conclude, that the question in hand ought not to be determined by particular Doctors of this or that Communion. It is not what an *Erasmus*, or a *Cassander*, or an *Espencæus*, or *Ferus*, do teach; nor what a *Bellarmine*, a *Stapleton*, a *Scioppius*, a *Pighius*, nor what the *Spanish* Divines in some cases at *Trent*, or the *French* Divines in point of Supremacy, and defence of the *Pragmatical Sanction*; nor wherein the *Thomists* and *Scotists*, the *Dominicans* and *Jesuites*, do conflict: That were an incongruous method, either to discern their minds by, or to accommodate any *Syncretismes*, or fallacious *Unims*: These are but personal Opinions, they'l stand to none of their Doctors. But what Councils and Authorized Assemblies, what Confessions and Catechismes, composed by their direction and warranty, have determined; there lyes the Rule of Enquiry, and therefore I shall here touch upon no Authorities or Citations, but such as are found in the Canon-Law, the Council and Catechism of *Trent*, their Missals, Bulls, and Determinations from the Chair. As for others, but *obiter & per transennam*, as collateral proofs, or confirm'd by Papal Edicts; or such Authors as have pass'd the tryal of their Purging Indexes, set out by their own Authority. Let's then proceed to some Enquiries in this Affair.

Reg. Jur. 88. 6 Decretal. E 5.

Mat. 15. 6.

Ambros. in 1 Cor. 4. col. 1892.

(1.) Is that a true Church of Christ that determines Fundamental Doctrines contrary to Christ and his Apostles, that builds upon another Foundation than Christ? That they have assumed *Peter* for the onely Head of the Militant Church, might be abundantly proved: Insomuch, that if Princes and Emperours doe but perform their duty as keepers of both Tables, how greatly are they offended? As when *Charles* 5. took to himself some Spiritual Jurisdiction, how does *Baronius* exclaim, as if he set up another Head of the Church, *pro monstro & ostento*, as a portentuous Monster; which might with much more truth be retorted upon themselves in respect to our Lord, whom they rob of his Glory when they ascribe it to *Peter*. Let but *Peter* be imprisoned by *Agrippa*, how does the same *Baronius* cry out, *Magno sanè terræmotu Ecclesia Christi tunc concuti visa est, cum ipsa Petra in Ecclesiæ fundamento locata, tanta agitatione quassari conspiceretur*: The Church of Christ truely then seem'd to be shaken with a great Earth-quake, when the very Rock placed in the Foundation of the Church, was seen to be so sorely shaken. It seems *Peter* was the Rock placed by Christ for the

Baron. ad Ann. 1097. n. 28.

Ann. 44. n. 3.

Foundation of the Church; But let's look a little further. *Clemens* in his first Epistle to *James* the Brother of our Lord, written to him after the Apostle was dead, (as the learned *Crakanthorp* hath proved,) which is set forth at *Basil*, and by *Turrian* and others, and is extant in the first Tome of the Councils, and ratified by the Canon Law, which speaks thus: *Simon Petrus*, &c. *veræ Fidei merito, & integræ Prædicationis obtentu, fundamentum esse Ecclesiæ definitus est: Simon Peter* by the merit of his true Faith, and having obtained it by his sincere preaching, is defined to be the Foundation of the Church. The Divinity transcends the Latin in Barbarisme; But it seems by the Forger, that it was our Lords doing, consonant to after Popes asserting the same, "That *he* committed to *Peter*, the blessed Key-keeper of Eternal Life, the Laws "both of the Earthly and Heavenly Empire. And again, treating of *Peter*; *Hunc in consortium individuæ unitatis assumptum, id quod ipse erat voluit nominari, dicendo, Tu es Petrus, &c. ut æterni ædificatio Templi, mirabili munere gratiæ Dei in Petri soliditate consisteret:* This person being taken into fellowship of individual Unity, (*O fearfull!*) he would have him called that which he was, saying, *Thou art Peter, &c.* that the building of the Eternal Temple might consist in the solidity of *Peter*, by the wonderfull gift of the Grace of God. This needs no Gloss. But the learned Glossators upon the common Extravagants, after they have expounded *Cephas* to signifie a *Head*, they proceed: *Sicut in corpore materiali est ponere caput unum, in quo sunt omnes sensus seu plenitudo sentiendi: Sic in Ecclesiâ militante (ne sit tanquam corpus monstruosum, si duo haberet capita) est tantum ponere unum caput, viz. Rom. Pontificem, in quo est plenitudo potestatis, & auctoritatis*, &c. As in a material Body there is but one Head placed, in which are all the Senses, or a fulness of Sensation; so in the Church militant, (lest it should be like a monstrous Body, if it have two heads) there is but one Head placed, *viz.* the *Roman* Bishop; in whom is the Fulness of Power and Authority. And *Boniface* 8th, *in Extrav. Comm. l.* 1. *c.* 1. *de Majorit. Igitur Ecclesiæ unius & unicæ, unum corpus, unum caput, non duo capita, quasi monstrum, Christus*, viz. *& Christi Vicarius, Petrus, Petrique Successor*, &c. Therefore, of the one onely Church, one Body, one Head, not two Heads, like a *Monster*, *&c.* Christ and *Peter*, Christ's Vicar and *Peters* Successors. By these Doctrines we are now clearly illuminated, that as to the influence and Government of the militant Church, Christ hath excluded himself from Headship, lest the Body should be monstrous, with two Heads. Such fearfull and tremendous points are taught South of the Mountains. But the truth is, they speak of themselves, and seek their own Glory; and not Christs, whose Commandments they have annulled and evacuated by their many Additions to and Substractions from his. They would seem indeed to retain all, onely adde some; but whosoever addes as well as detracts, is lyable to the Curse of God: for hereby they stain the Glory of the Divine Law, as insuffi-

Crakanthorp Connects p. 422. *Basil.* 1526. *Turrian Paris*, 1568. f. 326. *Dist.* 80. c. 2. f. 507. & Caus. 6. q. 1. c. 5. & caus. 11. q. 3. c. 12. & 15. Edit. Rom.

Dist. 20. c. 1. p. 130.

Dist. 19. c. 7. p. 110. Edit. Rom. 1582.

Extrav. l. 5. c. 1. p. 345. Rom. Edit.

Joh. 7. 18.

Deut. 12. 32. Prov. 30. 6. Rev. 22. 18. Gal. 1. 8.

insufficient and imperfect, and more especially when they add Fundamental Points upon peril of Damnation; when they frame new Articles of Faith, as Pope *Pius* the 4th hath done. Articles are Principles, and therefore indemonstrable, except by Scripture: Now when new ones are added, *de fide*, extraneous to the holy Scriptures, nay repugnant in such mighty and weighty matters, can any man alive, that is not deep in the golden Cup, sedately believe the true Church of Christ to be there; When, 1. They require firm Faith in the Traditions, Observations, and Constitutions of the Church of *Rome*: And, 2. Tye all Churches to *their* sence of the Scriptures: And, 3. To hold Seven Sacraments to be instituted by Christ: And, 4. The *Trent* Doctrine about Justification: 5. The Propitiatory Sacrifice in the Mass: 6. Transubstantiation: 7. Purgatory: 8. Invocation of Saints: 9. Adoration of Images: 10. Indulgences: 11. The *Roman* Church to be Mistress of all Churches, and the Bishop thereof Christs Vicar: 12. And all things in the Canons and Councils, but especially of *Trent*; and in the conclusion, *Hanc veram catholicam fidem, extra quam nemo salvus esse potest*, &c. *profiteor & veraciter teneo*, &c. You must profess and truely hold this to be the true *catholick Faith*, without which none can be saved. *Art.* 1. Bull. *Pii* 4. super formâ juramenti professionis fidei.

But for the easing of mens Minds in these and the like particulars, they cry up the Immensity of their Power, and Priviledge, to dispense with Scripture and Apostolical Doctrine. Indeed there's great need *that* should be well proved; and the Canon-Law has done the deed. For in the first place, It is pronounced *ex Cathedrâ*, from the very Chair of *Peter*; *Subesse Romano Pontifici omnem humanam creaturam, declaramus, dicimus, diffinimus & pronunciamus, omninò esse de necessitate salutis*: Pope *Boniface* the 8th. hath very well express'd it in his definitive Sentence: "We declare, affirm, determine, and pronounce, that it is "altogether *necessary to Salvation*, that every humane creature be sub- "ject to the Pope of *Rome*. Is not this Doctrine wonderfull clear in Holy Scriptures, and obvious in every Page? But lest we should mistake the places, we shall be help'd out with some dispensations as to Scripture. *Extrav. Com.* l. 1. c. 1. de Major. & Obed. n. 2 & 3. Romæ, & Quicunque salvatur, est sub summo Pontifice. *Ib. Gloss.* col. 805.

The Gloss upon Pope *Nicholas* his Rescript to the Bishops of *France*, expressely sayes, *Contra Apostolum dispensat*; That he may dispense against the Apostle, and against Natural Right. And again, upon an Edict of Pope *Martins*; *Sic ergo Papa dispensat contra Apostolum*: So then, the Pope dispenses against the Apostle. And *Greg.* 13. addes a Note out of *Aquinas*, *Non est absurdum quoad jus positivum*: It is not absurd as to a positive Law. And again, *Secundum plenitudinem potestatis de jure possumus supra jus dispensare*: Where the Gloss addes, *Nam contra Apostolum dispensat, & contra Canones Apostolorum: Item contra Vetus Testamentum in Decimis*: According to fulness of Power, we can of Right dispense above or beyond Right: For he dispenses against the Apostle, and against the Canons of the Apostles, and against *Caus.* 15. q. 6. c. 2. Rom. col. 1443. *Dist.* 34. c. 18. p. 230. *Decretal.* l. 3. Tit. 8. c. 4. col. 672.

Mat. 5. 32. & 19. 9. *Cauſ.* 32. *q.* 7. *c.* 18. *col.* 2156. Rom. 12. 17. Mat. 5. 39. *Sext. decretal. Tit.* 11. *c.* 6. *p.* 717. *Diſt.* 82. *c.* 5. *col.* 529.

the Old Teſtament, in Tithes. Our Lord determines Marriage not to be diſſolved, but in caſe of Whoredom; but *Greg.* 3. orders, If a Wife be infirm, *ad debitum*, then *jugalis nubat magis*, let her Husband marry rather, *qui non poteſt continere.* Our Lord teaches, not to *reſiſt evil*, but *Innocent* 4th teaches, *Vim vi repellere, & utcunque gladium, &c. alterum altero adjuvare*; To reſiſt force with force, and help out one Sword with another. I might ſhew it in the caſe of Oaths and Vows, and ſeveral others, as, If a Prieſt commit Fornication, though by the Canons of the Apoſtles he ought to be depoſed, yet by the Authority of *Sylveſter*, let him doe Penance for ten years, *&c.* But enough of this.

Let's proceed to ſhew their Power in the point of Subtractions, in ſome particulars.

Firſt, As to the Holy *Scriptures*, let's obſerve ſeveral points.

1. They ſubſtitute the Vulgar *Latin* Tranſlation to be the Authentick Word of God, inſtead of the Original Hebrew and Greek: Of which an Author of their own atteſts, That the *Roman* Church permits not the Scriptures but in Lattin. But we need no further witneſs than the Sanction of *Trent*, which appoints and declares, That the Old Vulgar Edition, *&c.* ſhould be uſed for the Authentical, in publick Lectures, Diſputes, Preachings, and Expoſitions, and that none dare or preſume to reject it upon any pretenſe.

Hiſt. of *Cardinals*, *p.* 4.

Seſſ. 4.

2. The Common People are not to read them. Indeed *Pius* 4th, in the fourth Rule for the managing of the purging Indexes of Books prohibited according to the appointment of *Trent*, grants to read them, if tranſlated by *catholick* Authors, and leave had from the Prieſt or Confeſſor, elſe not. Since as they ſay, *Si paſſim ſine diſcrimine permittantur, plus inde ob hominum temeritatem detrimenti quam utilitatis oriri.* If they be commonly permitted without diſtinction, more detriment riſes than profit, through the raſhneſs of men. But in *Clement* the 8th, his obſervation on that fourth Rule, this facu'ty or licenſe of reading or retaining vulgar Bibles, is wholly taken away, and concludes, *Quod quidem inviolatè ſervandum eſt*, Which is to be kept inviolably.

Index libr. prohib. Reg. 4.

Obſ. in Reg. 4. *Rhotun.* 1640. *ad calcem Concil. Trident.*

3. They muſt be received and underſtood according to the ſence of the *Roman* Church: *Cujus eſt judicare de vero ſenſu & interpretatione Scripturarum ſanctarum*; In whoſe Authority it is, to judge of the ſence and interpretation of the Holy Scriptures. It's ſaid of *Avecroes*, that he anoynted *Avicens* Books with Poyſon, in deſign upon him; and what cauſe we have to fear the like from their Commentaries, let the Learned judge. But beſides, ſince the *Lateran* Decree of the Popes Superiority to a Council, we are in the dark what their Church is; but *Paul* the Second expounded it to poor *Platina*, as himſelf relates. *Torvis oculis me aſpiciens*, &c. *ac ſi neſcires omnia jura in Scrinio pectoris noſtri collocata eſſe, ſic ſtat ſententia; loco cedant omnes, eant quo volunt, nihil eos moror;*

Concil. Trid. Seſſ. 4. & *Pii* 2. *Bulla ſuper form. juram. profeſſ. fidei, Art.* 2.

Platin. in *Paul* 2. *f.* 336. *a. Edit. Par.* 1505.

moror; *Pontifex sum, mihique licet, pro arbitrio animi, aliorum acta & rescindere et approbrare:* Let it be English'd by the Abbots Version; "Know ye not that I am infallible, and carry all their Judgements and "Reasons in the Cabinet of my Breast. I consider no mans Person, I am "Pope, and 'tis in my Power to null or confirm their Acts, as I think good "my self. This case is manifest. *Hist. Cardinals*, p. 122.

4. They equal the *Canons* and Traditions to the *Scriptures*: *Pari pietatis affectu ac reverentiâ suscipit et veneratur.* They receive and reverence the one with equal pious affection as the other: And for this in the Canon-Law we have ample testimony. All the Sanctions of the Apostolical Seat, are to be received, as if confirmed by the Voyce of holy *Peter* himself; and although the yoke imposed by that holy Seat, be scarce tolerable, yet let us bear and endure it with a pious Devotion: And if any man sin against them, *Noverit sibi veniam denegari*, Let him know, that pardon shall be denyed him. Again, *Nulli fas est, vel velle, vel posse transgredi Apostolicæ sedis præcepta*: It is lawfull for none, so much as to *will*, much less to be *able* to transgress the Precepts of the Apostolical Chair. Again, The Popes Decretal Epistles are expressely reckoned among Canonical Scriptures. *Inter quas sane illæ sint quas Apostolica sedes habere, et ab ea alii meruerunt accipere Epistolas*: Among which surely those Epistles are to be, which the Apostolical Seat receives, and which others have deserved to receive from thence. Further, the Violation of Canons they state it to be Blasphemy, and a sin against the Holy Ghost. Nay, as to some Discipline, and the ancient Institution of Christian Religion, *Tantâ Reverentiâ apicem Apostolicæ sedis omnes suspiciunt, ut magis*, &c. *ab ore præcessoris ejus quàm à sacris paginis*, &c. *expetant*, &c. With such Reverence do all look up to the Pinacle of the Apostolical Seat, that they *rather* receive from the Mouth of his Predecessor, than from the holy Scriptures. So that the matter may well be reduced to the Edict of the *Jesuites* at *Dole*, mentioned by Sir *Edw. Sands*, having thus effectually deprived the People of the holy Scriptures; to avoid all further contests and troubles in Religion, forbid any talk of God either in good sort or bad. Thus we must bid adieu to holy Scriptures, and (as one sayes) embrace their holy Trumperies. For if any man desire to know which is the true Church; how should he know it but *onely* by the Scripture. *Auth. Op. Imperfect. in Matth. Hom.* 49.

Trident. Sess. 3 *Dist.* 19. *c.* 2. & *c.* 3. *col.* 106.

Dist. 19. *c.* 1. *col.* 105.

Dist. 19. *c.* 5. *col.* 109. & *Ivo. Epist.* 8. *Par.* 1610. & *Synod. Rem.* p. 47. *Francof.* 1600.

Dist. 19. *c.* 6. *col.* 107.

Caus. 25. *q.* 1. *c.* 5. *col.* 1897.

Dist. 40. *c.* 6. *col.* 259.

Sir *Edw. Sands* Survey of Relig. in the *West*, *p.* 231.

Secondly, They take away the *Cup* in the *Lords Supper* from the Christian People, and that with a *Non-obstante*. *Licet Christus post cœnam instituerit, &c.* Although Christ did after Supper ordain, and administer to his Disciples in both the Elements of Bread and Wine, this Venerable Sacrament, *tamen hoc non obstante*, yet nevertheless, the Authority of Sacred Canons, the laudable and approved custom of the Church, hath kept and doth keep, *&c. & habenda est pro Lege*, they pass it into a Law, to communicate in one kind, and pronounce such to be.

Concil. Constant. Sess. 13. *f.* 515. *Crabirob.* 2.

be dealt with as Hereticks, that oppose this new Law made in defiance of Christ, and the Primitive Church. What a Church is this, that puts a Barre to Christ! Pray resolve how blessed and obedient a Spouse this is.

Mat. 19. 5,6. 1 Cor. 7. 2. 1 Tim. 3. 2. & 4. 7. Heb. 13. 4.

Thirdly, Though our blessed Lord and his Apostles, commend *Marriage* as the Institution of God, and honourable among all, and the forbidding of it repulsed, as the Doctrine of Devils; yet there s founder Advice it seems to be found in the Canon-Law: "Priests Marriage is "not forbid by the Authority of Law or Gospel, or of the Apostles, *Ec-* "*clesiasticâ tamen lege penitus interdicitur*, yet by Ecclesiastical Law it "is utterly forbidden. And they may commit Fornication, and not be deposed, and their gloss gives this satisfying Reason, *Quia hodiè fragiliora sunt corpora nostra quam olim erant*; Because our Bodies are now adayes more frail than they were of old: And though, to take a second Wife, *Secundum præceptum Apostoli est*, That's but according to the Præcept of the Apostle, *Secundum veritatis autem rationem verè Fornicatio est*; Yet according to the account of Truth, verily it is Fornication: *Sed dum permittente Deo publicè et licenter committitur, fit honesta Fornicatio*; But when it is publickly † committed, and with license, by the permission of God, it becomes *honest fornication*. And for Adultery it's counted among the lesser crimes. *De adulteriis verò et aliis criminibus, quæ sunt minora.* A Bishop may dispense with his Clerks. More of the like stuffe may be read in *Pelagius* his Rescript to the Bishop of *Florence*, and Reason rendred, *Quia corpora ipsa hominum defecerunt*; Because the very Bodies of men are grown weak. And if a Clerk embrace a Woman, it's to be expounded to bless her, *caus.* 11. *q.* 3. *c.* 14. *col.* 1223. But for these and the like cases, the Tax of the Apostolical Chancery gives the richest Reasons, where any thing is dispens'd with for Money: A Book wherein (saith *Espenceus*) thou may'st learn more wickedness than in all the *Summists* and Summaries of all Vices; set forth in the dayes of Pope *Leo* the 10th, who made that infamous Reply to Cardinal *Benbus*, *Quantum nobis ac nostro cætui profuit ea de Christo fabula, satis est sæculis omnibus notum:* It's known well enough to all Ages, how much that Fable of Christ hath benefited us and our Society. Well might the Abbot of *Ursberg* cry out, *Gaude mater nostra Roma*, &c. Rejoyce, O *Rome*, our Mother, for the Cataracts of Treasures are opened in the Earth, that Rivers of Money may flow in to thee: Rejoyce over the iniquity of the Sons of men, for thou receivest the price for a Recompence of such great wickedness.

† *Licentèr*] *quia pœnam temporalem non patiebantur.* Because they suffered not temporal punishment. *Gloss. ibid.*

Decretal. l. 2. de Judic. c. 4. col. 523.

Dist. 34. c. 7. col. 125.

Espenc. in Tit. cap. 1. digr. 2. p. 67. Edit. Par. 1568 and the *Cent. in gravamina in Fascic. rerum.* 178.

Ranchin Review of *Trent.* p. 79.

Valera, of the Lives of Popes p. 150. out of *P. Jovius.*

Urspeg. Chron. p. 135 Argentor. 1609.

Fourthly, For Prohibition of Meats. Whereas the Apostle tells us, *Whatever is sold in the Shambles, that eat, asking no question for Conscience sake*; and *let no man judge you in meat or drink*. For God hath created them to be *received with thanksgiving*, of them which believe, and know the truth, and *nothing to be refused*. Such as believe in God, and are acquainted with the truth of his holy Word, make no scruple,

1 Cor. 10. 25. Col. 2. 16. 1 Tim. 4. 3, 4.

as

as those who *speak Lies in Hypocrisie*, and are seducing Spirits. But the Canon-Law commands Fastings, as a tenth part of time consecrated to God out of the whole year, and against our eating of Flesh, assigns a pregnant citation out of the Apostle; *Bonum est Vinum non bibere & carnes non comedere:* It's good not to drink Wine, nor to eat Flesh. But the connexat words are left out, which referre to Offence in the Primitive times. But I shall not further touch this point: their Precepts and Practices stand opposite to the Holy Scriptures; but how wholsom to the Body to appoint their grand Fasts, and abstinence from Flesh, in the Spring, let *Fuchsius* a learned Physician be Judge, out of *Soranus* and *Hippocrates*. *Quod verno tempore minimè sit jejunandum*: We ought least of all to fast in the Spring-time. And after he hath urg'd his Argument, he closes; *Romanum Pontificem non solum esse* Antichristum, *&c.* That the *Roman* Bishop is not only Antichrist, in stating a Doctrine contrary to Christ, but *Atiatrum*, contrary to Physicians; to appoint a Fast *then*, and forbid flesh; when they have unanimously taught, we ought to eat more largely, and abstain from Fish. But it became the Man of Perdition, not onely to destroy our Souls but our Bodies also, by his Decrees, and our Purses also, (imitating *Peter* in fishing for Money at the Sea of *Galilee*, *Matt.* 17. 27.) we must buy of him leave at that time to eat Milk, and the like Viands.

1 Tim. 4. 1, 2.

Decr. 3 part. de Consecr. dist. 5. c. 16. col. 2671.

Dist. 35. c. 2. col. 231.

Fuchs. Instit. Medicin. lib. 1. sect. 2. cap. 9.

But to finish this Paragraph; of such a Society as adde to, subtract from, dispense with, and over-rule the Laws of God; what should all the sober and pious judge, but what the Scripture hath Prophetically decipher'd them to be, and what the Church of *England* hath determined concerning them; that since they have forsaken, and daily doe forsake the Commandments of God, to erect and set up their own Constitutions, we may well conclude, according to the Rule of *Augustine*, that the Bishops of *Rome*, and their adherents, are *not the true Church of Christ*, much less then to be taken as chief Heads and Rulers of the same. Whosoever, saith he, do dissent from the Scriptures concerning the Head, although they be found in all places, where the Church is appointed, yet are they not in the Church. A plain place, concluding directly against the Church of *Rome*.

Homilie of the Church of *England*, in the 2d part of the Sermon for *Whit-Sunday*, 4to. f. 229. b.

(2) Is that the true Church of Christ, that *pollutes* the *Worship* of God by *Idolatry?* Why is this Sin so often called *whoredom* in Scripture? Does not Whoredom dissolve the bonds of Marriage, by our Lords own determination? Did not the Lord give up the ancient *Israel* and *Judah*, and disavow them from being his Spouse, under the name of two notable Whores, *Aholah* and *Aholibah*: and if we rightly consider the *Revelations*, we find also this to be the very cause, why the Name of *Whore* is branded upon the forehead of a certain Congregation that was to appear in the World after the dissolution of *Rome Imperial*; and therefore God sent the *Saracens* and *Turks* against them, with stings both in Head and tayl, both in the East and West, but yet they *repented not* of their Idols,

2 Cor. 6. 15.

Ezek. 23. 4.

Rev. 9. 20, 21.

Idols, *&c.* This is that Generation which layes stumbling-blocks, both before *Turks*, *Jews* and Heathens. For haste, I le instance but in a few. Among the Four great Offences and Scandals, which the Grand Seignior told the *German* Ambassadour he took at the *Roman* Religion, one was, that they made their God in the Church; another, that they eat him in the Eucharist. What would he have said, had he heard of the Emperour *Henry* the 7th, his being poysoned out of the Sacrament Cup, by a *Guelph* of the Popes Faction, or as Dr. *Donne* expresses it more earnestly, To poyson their God, that they might poyson their Emperour? But how greatly the *Turks* are incensed against Idols, the *Alcoran* almost every where discovers, and *Hottinger*, *Sands*, and others. As for the *Jews*, how greatly they are scandalized, we may observe even in Elder times, when the Second Council of *Nice* was fain to give a solemn though a sorry answer to them, [ὄυτως φοβερὸς ὁ λὸγος ὃ ἐντελλόμενος τῷ Ισραὴλ, &c.] Verily, it was a terrible word, giving command to *Israel*, Not to make any carved Image, &c. and yet afterward to command *Moses* to make Cherubims, yet not as Gods, but for Rememoration onely, *&c.* Not to observe at present how they shift off the Second Commandement, as if belonging to *Israel* onely; nor what they further reply about the framing of Images, not to be ultimate Objects of Worship, but onely commemorative helps of Devotion: That which I would principally take notice of, is, that even then at the first solemn and Judicial publication of Image-doctrine, how greatly the *Jews* were provoked and offended; who were so exact in the abhorrency of Images, that they counted it unlawfull to look up to an Image in Civil use; and forbad the very Art of Painters and Statuaries: Nay, so nice and curious, that they scruple to pluck out a Thorn out of their feet, or gather up Money casually fallen, lest they should seem to stoop down in respect to any Image in such a place; and as to the present indelible continuance of the same hatred, Sir *Edw. Sands* hath given a large account; and how they call Popish Churches, because of the worship of Images in them, בית התרפה, *The Houses of Idolatry*, or *filthinesses*, with some remarkable Observations out of their Authors, may be seen in the Learned *Hornbeck*, his Treatise against the *Jews*.

Count *Serini's* Character, *p.* 107. *Paralip. Ursperg.* p. 267. *Naucler. p.* 991. *Donnes Pseudomartyr*, p. 91. *Alcoran. c.* 10, 11, 13, 16, &c. *Hottinger*, the same, *p.* 60. *Sands*, p. 54. *Synod. Septim. Act.* 4. p. 556. *Tom.* 3. *Binii.* & *Dailly de Imag.* p. 68. *Hottinger. jur. Hebr. p.* 336. *Id.* p. 41. View of *Religion in the* West. *Hornbeck cont. Judæos*, *proleg.* p. 17. and the learned *L. Sarson* in his Roman *Cultûs Nullitas*, p. 15. *Gage*, Survey of the *West-Indies*, *p.* 175.

As to the Pagans or Heathens, I might enlarge, but I shall onely referre to a story of the *Americans*, who being vex'd at the burning their wooden God, by Mr. *Gage*; replyed, That they knew it was a piece of wood, and *of it self* could not speak, but seeing it had spoken (as they were all witnesses) this was a Miracle whereby they ought to be guided, and they did verily believe that God was in that piece of wood, which (since the speech made by it) was more than ordinary wood, having God himself in it, and therefore deserved more Offerings and Adorations than those Saints (*i. e.* of the *Spaniards*) in the Church; who did never speak unto people. And to this may be annex'd, since it touches upon Saint-Worship,) what *Sancta Clara* insinuates, as a Reason why there's no

no Precept under the Gospel for Invocation of Saints, *&c.* Least the converted Gentiles should believe, that they were again reduced to the Worship of Men, (*terrigenarum*) and according to their old custome, should adore Saints not as Patrons but as Gods. To conclude this point, since God hath so severely forbidden the Worshipping of his Divine Majesty by Statues, Pictures, Sculptures or Images, and in all Ages given ample Evidences of his wrath against such Worshippers: Since the true Christian Religion by means of such titular and nominal pretenders to it, is greatly vilified and obstructed in its progress, as to the sincere Conversion both of *Turks*, *Jews* and Heathens; we may easily discern where that dangerous Society resides, that commit Fornication with Stocks and Stones, termed by the Church of *England*, in her excellent and zealous Homilies against Idolatry, "A foul, filthy, old withered Harlot, *&c.* that "understanding her lack of natural and true beauty, and great loathsom- "ness (which of her self she hath) doth after the custom of such Harlots, "paint her self, and deck and tire her self with Gold, Pearl, Stone, and "all kind of precious Jewels.

Sancta Clara Deus natura Gratia p. 323. de invoc. Sanct.

Homily of the Church of *Engl.* in 3d. part of the Sermon against the *Peril of Idolatry*, f. 75. *b.*

(3.) Is that the true Church of Christ, that out of her own Invention, intermixt with *Jewish* and Heathenish Customs (as might be specified out of *Blondus*, *Polydore Virgil*, and others) hath patch'd up a pompous Worship, and bottom'd *now* upon that grand Fundamental of the *Popes Authority*, which (as 'tis said of *Jeroboams*,) is *devised of their own hearts*, and in comparison to the Institutions of Christ, and Scriptural, Apostolical, Primitive practice, is as it were but a Novelty, and of Yesterday. As to which, the History of the Church in most things gives us a precise account of their particular Rise and Genealogy; in the rest, we may evidently prove by the primitive Administrations, that *then they were not*, and afterward find, *when they were* in use and practice; though the exact moment of their intrusion be not determinable: Since they did, *sensim sine sensu*, secretly creep in, by the subtle artifice of some, and the sequacious temper of others; and likewise, that the barbarous times of the *Goths* and *Vandals*, making fearfull havock of Learning, and the rare Monuments of Antiquity, hath destroyed many Records. But however, there are great heaps of Rubbish and Soil, that might easily be sented up to their original Stable: Let's but instance in a few. The use of fine Linnen, Prayers in odd Numbers, Sanctuaries, Wax-candles, Worship towards the East, Ember-dayes, Consecrations, and the *Bacchanalia*, and other Feasts turned into the present Festivities; their Origine, and multitudes of others, may be observed out of *Polydor*, *Innocent* 3. *Durandus* his *Rationale*, and *Durantus de Ritibus*, *Rupertus Tuitiensis*, *Gavantus*, *Gratian*, *Ivo*, *Blondus*, and many others. Give me leave a little to enlarge upon one Constitution of the greatest moment, because 'tis a Fundamental amongst them, *&c.* The Decree of the *Lateran* Council under *Leo* the 10th, whereby the Popes Authority was fully settled, and whence he became exalted above a Council, and

1 King. 12. 33.

Polyd. Virgil. Bas. 1532. *Innocent.* 3. de Altari, Lips. 1534. *&c.*

Infallible, and to be adored; as 'tis in the *Ceremoniale Romanum*, l. 1. *p.* 51. & *l.* 3. *p.* 286. and 'tis this: *Solum Romanum Pontificem pro tempore existentem, tanquam Auctoritatem super omnia Concilia habentem*, &c. *manifestè constat.* It clearly appears, *&c.* that the *Roman* Bishop solely, for the time being, as having Authority over all Councils. And then, *p.* 121. *Cum de necessitate salutis existat omnes Christi fideles, Romano Pontifici subesse*: It is *necessary to Salvation*, that all Christs faithfull ones should be subject to the *Roman* Bishop. This was determined the 14 *Kal. Jan.* 1516. within the compass of the same year wherein *Luther* began to assault them, as may be observed out of *Sultetus* his Annals. Whence we may note, what a profound Question that is, when they demand of us, Where our Religion was before *Luther?* when as themselves do date the Commencement of the greatest point and Pillar of their Religion, *viz.* The Doctrine of *Infallibility*, within the same year wherein *Luther* arose; putting the Hay and Stubble of their infallible Judge, into the Foundation of the Church. Whereas, one of their own could boldly and freely assert, "That though the Catholicks "accuse them of pinning their Faith upon *Luther* and *Calvin*, which is "false: for neither *Luther* nor *Calvin* instituted any new Religion. When they ask, Where was ours? we answer, Where theirs is not; *sc.* Instituted by our blessed Lord, preached by the holy Apostles, set forth in the sacred Scriptures, and practised by the Primitive Churches, and preserved all along by some notable Confessors of the Truth in every Age, to our present times. But theirs indeed, as it now stands, built upon the *Lateran* and *Trent*-Councils, in their main Fundamental, is but a meer Novelty, started up in the very dayes of *Luther*; and in other things wherein they dissent from us, is but of later invention, in comparison with the Primitive Apostolical times. And in how many grand and weighty particulars (besides their accessory and gaudy Ceremonies) they dissent from Scriptures, forsake the Apostles, run contrary to the Sanctions of ancient Councils, might be at large educed out of Authentick Records, and demonstrated to be but a Novelty.

Binii Concil. Tom. 4. part. 2. Concil. Lateran. Sess. 11. Dat. Rom. 1515. 14 Kal. Jan.

Sultet. Annal. Ann. 1516.

Hist. Caridinals, *p.* 9.

Obj. But are there not several things found in the Reformed Churches that are of the same standing, and savour of equal Novelty, of which it may be said, *Non sic ab initio*, It was not so from the Beginning.

A. To which it may be replyed, That 'tis the duty of all Reformations, to come up exactly to Scripture, and what is not done at one time, *in levioribus aliquot*, in some smaller matters, may be performed at another. The ingenious *Bernard* glossing upon that of the *Canticles*, [*O thou faires among Women,*] speaks thus; *Pulchram, non omnimodè quidem, sed pulchram inter mulieres eam docet*, viz. *cum distinctione, quatenus ex hoc amplius reprimatur, & sciat quid desit sibi:* He calls her Fair, yet not altogether, but faires among women, *sc.* with a distinction; that hence she may be somewhat the more checkt, and know wherein she is defective. There's no Church under Heaven perfectly beautifull,

Preface to the Common-prayer.

Bernard in Cantic. Serm. 38. f. 144. 2.

beautifull, *that* remains for Glory, when Christ will present her to himself *without spot or wrinkle*. If but pretended Watchmen take away her spotted Vail, she'l be glad of a purer. *Fas est & ab hoste doceri*: It's wisdom to learn by the reproof of an Adversary. But as to the grand Fundamental points, we unanimously agree; we lay no other Foundation than the Rock Christ Jesus, and seriously profess the Scriptures to be our perfect Rule; and if any will teach us wherein we swerve, we are ready to yield Obedience to the Laws of Christ. So that (as the learned *Crakanthorp* determines) those persons, as *Irenæus*, *Justin Martyr*, and *Cyprian*, &c. though in some things they might erre, yet because they thought those things to be taught in Scripture, which they made their Guide, and were ready to reform upon Eviction out of the Holy Scriptures, they no doubt dyed in the Faith: But he teaches the contrary of those that hold the Popes infallible Judgement in Causes of Faith, for that's none of God's Foundation, whereupon to ground our Belief or practice.

Eph. 5. 26. Cant. 5. 7.

Crakanth. of Councils, p. 181.

(4.) Can that be deemed a true Church of Christ successively in all Ages, that *varies from it self*, contradicts it self, makes Decrees quite contrary to precedent times, and that in matters of Faith? And if the Philosopher said right, that there is no *medium* in a perfect Contradiction; if the one be true, the other is equally as false; what shall be deemed of such a Society, that in the great matters of Faith have determined quite contrary, besides many other things of grand importance? Truth is alwayes Homogeneal, consistent and invariable. But here's Pope against Pope, Council against Council, one Society, Order and Fraternity against another: where shall a poor Christian (*sistere pedem*) fix his Resolution? If the former be true, the latter are undenyably false; if the latter be true, in what a case were the Fore-fathers of Old? in what state did they leave the world? how might this amaze the drowsie and inchanted world, did it but awaken to muse seriously on this point onely? Have not Popes from the Chair determined against each other, and that in matters of Faith, and other weighty cases? How *Sylverius* and *Vigilius* clash'd and conflicted, in that grand point of the three Chapters agitated in the fifth general Council, is at large set forth by the Learned *Crakanthorp*. Did not Pope *Agatho* determine quite contrary to Pope *Vigilius* in the same case, as may be observed in comparing the Actions of the fifth and sixth Council. *Stephen* the 6th, abrogates the Decrees of *Formosus*, digs up his Body, and cuts off the two fingers of his Right hand, which are used in Consecrations: And he addes, *Posteà ferè semper servata hæc consuetudo sit, ut Actu priorum Pontificum sequentes aut infringerent aut omninò tollerent*; That afterward this custom was almost alwayes kept up, That following Bishops did either invalidate or utterly take away the Acts of their Predecessors: Of which he gives Instances in *Romanus*, *Theodorus*, *John* 10. and *Sergius*. *Greg.* 1. determines him to be Antichristian, and to blaspheme, that should arrogate that profane

A. Postter. l. 1.

Crak. Councils, p. 471. & alibi.

Id. p. 28.

Platin. in vit. f. 139. *b.*

Greg. Regist. l. 4. Ep. 32. 36. l. 6. Ep. 31. &c. Rom. Edit.

Dist. 19. *c.*5. col. 107. *Dist.* 22. *c.* 1. col. 130. † *Fascic. rerum expet. Dist.* 81. *c.*15. col. 516, &c. *& Ivo. Decret.* 5 part. *de primat.* f. 153. *Decretal. l.*3. *Tit.* 33. *c.* 1. col. 1276. *Ib. l.* 4. *c.* 6. col. 1556. *Caus.* 27. *q.*2. *c.*20. col. 1991. & *Dist.* 31. *c.*1. *col.* 195.

Name of *Supreme* over all other; and calls him *the King over all the children of Pride.* But his Name-sake *Greg.* 4. deposes every one, [*Sit ruinæ suæ dolore prostratus*, &c.] whosoever does not obey the Apostolical Seat; and *Nicolas* 2. pronounces him without doubt for a Heretick; and that worthy person *Greg.*7. or *Hildebrand*,(as set out by † *Benno* the Cardinal, and others,) stigmatizes such with the Brands of Idolatry, Witchcraft and Paganisme, *Quisquis dum Christianum se asserit, sedi Apostolicæ obedire contemnit*; Whosoever asserting himself for a Christian, contemns to obey the Apostolical Chair. Again, *Cœlestine* 3. determines against a Divorce between Christians and Infidels, but *Innocent* 3. determines the contrary. Again, *Pelag.* 2. had commanded, that the Sub-deacons of *Sicily* should abstain from their Wives, but *Greg.* 1. sayes 'tis *durum & incompetens*, hard and inconvenient, and allowes the quite contrary; and the Glos's addes, That the Statute of *Pelagius* was against the Gospel. There are multitudes of Cases might be added, wherein they made no scruple to rescind, abrogate, and decree contrary to their Predecessors. But I shall (for haste sake) speak a little of the variance of *Councils* also.

Concil. Basil. in Epistola Synodali ad universos Christi fideles.

The Council of *Constance* determines thus: *Est de necessitate salutis, credere Generale Concilium habere supremam Autoritatem in Ecclesiâ*: It is of *Necessity to Salvation*, to believe that a General Council hath *supreme* Authority in the Church; yea over the Pope himself: And this is ratified by Pope *Martin* the 5th, as the Fathers of *Basil* set it forth to all the world; and yet you have seen before, how that the *Lateran* Council hath determined the quite contrarry, stating it in those very words, That it is *necessary to Salvation*, that all Christs Faithfull ones should be subject to the *Roman* Bishop, and in that very point, as having Authority over all Councils.

*Concil. Tom.*2. *p.* 340. a. *P.* 285. b. *P.* 305. a.

The Council of *Orange*, in many Canons, and that of *Milevis*, or *Melci* in *Numidia*, neer *Algier*, and the *African* Council (commonly so called) determine against *Free-will.* The Council of *Gangra* (now *Congria*) by the River *Halys*, determines *Anathema* to such as refuse to communicate with a married Priest. But these things are contradicted by *Trent.* The like might be shewn about *Romes* Jurisdiction, and communicating the *Cup* to the People, the Conception of the Blessed Virgin, and several other Points, which would swell too large: Neither will time admit the several varieties and Confessions to be recited out of *Augustin* of *Tarracena*, found in *Gratian*; nor the private Oppositions of their Doctors, in numerous cases, collected by a Reverend person. I shall conclude this Section with an Observation about the Holy Bible it self; whose former Editions not satisfying *Sixtus* 5. set forth a new one, ratified by his Edict, *An.* 1589. Then comes *Clement* 8. *A.* 1592. with another *Breve*, commanding another new Edition to be received with equal Veneration, and the contemners of it exposed to new Imprecations and Curses; and yet these two Editions of the holy Bible, differ in

Gangr. concil. Can. 4, &c. Paris 1618. *p.* 313. *cum Zenarâ.*

Ep. *Hall's Peace of* Rome.

two

two thousand places, and some so material, that they arise to flat contradictions, which is made evident by Dr. *James*, in his *Bellum Papale*, and the Edicts themselves, (because the *Sixtine* Bibles are hard to come by) are at large set forth by the learned *Amama*. So that if their Popes decretory Sentences in matters of Faith, their Councils in points necessary to Salvation, their Doctors in great and important concerns of the Church, their very Bibles (such as they will permit) in multitudes of places egregiously differ one from another; where shall a Christian fix his mind, in such a Society, under such grand uncertainties, contradictions and Oppositions one to another, in the high and momentous Concernments of Eternity and the other World. *Amama Antibarb. bell.* 4to. p. 67. 98, &c.

(5.) Can such claim the Honour of being a true Church of Christ, which impiously derogate from the Essential Honour of God and of Jesus Christ? that exalt a sinfull man unto the Dignities and incommunicable Excellencies of the Divine Majesty? I trow not: But such there are, who highly pretend to Christ and his holy Church, and yet dare to open their mouths in strange and fearfull Expressions, in their *Canon-Law*; when they magnifie their *Roman* President: [He is said to have a heavenly Arbitrement, he changes the Natures of things, *&c.* he can make any thing of nothing. In what *he* wills, his Will stands for Reason; neither may any say, *Why dost thou so?* which is by *Job* applyed to God. He can make Justice out of Injustice, by correcting and changing of Laws, and hath the fulness of Power.] They alledge, *that the Pope was called God* by *Constantine*; and again, Not *Man* but *God* separates them, whom the *Roman* Bishop does, who bears the Viceroyship of the true God in the Earth, (but that never was nor can be proved). *Again*, To *believe* that the *Lord our God* the Pope, the Enactor of this Decree, could not so determine, is heretical. *Again*, It's Idolatry, Paganisme and Heresie, not to obey the *Roman* Seat: not one *Iota* of his Statutes must be disputed. *Again*, Christ professes himself to preside under the Faith and Name of *Peter*, &c. and although he lead innumerable People by Troops to Hell, (or *primo Mancipio Gehennæ, i.e. Diabolo*, sayes the Glos,) there to be eternally beaten with many stripes, yet none must reprove him, *&c.* And to name no more, The common Extravagants, treating of Christs Power and his Vicars, the Glos upon Pope *Boniface*, set out by *Greg.* 13. addes this, *Non videretur Dominus discretus fuisse, ut cum ejus reverentiâ loquar, nisi unicum post se talem Vicarium reliquisset qui hæc omnia posset:* "The Lord would not "seem to have been discreet, that I may speak with reverence of him, un"less he had left such an onely Vicar behind him, who might do all these "things. Whoso desires to know more of the like tremendous matter, may peruse *Ranchinus* his Review of the Council of *Trent*, an Author of their own, and many others. *Decretal. Greg.* 9. *l.* 1. *Tit.* 7. *c.* 3. *glos.* Job 9. 12. *Dist.* 96. *c.* 7. *Decretal. l.* 1. *Tit.* 7. *c.* 3. *glos.* *Extrav. Joan.* 22. *Tit.* 14. *c.* 4. col. 153. *Dist.* 81. *c.* 15. col. 517. & *dist.* 19. *c.* 5. *glos.* col. 107. *Extrav. Joan.* 22. *Tit.* 14. *c.* 4. *glos.* col. 145. *Cauf.* 24. *q.* 1. *c.* 10. *glos.* col. 1835. *Extrav. Com. l.* 1. *c.* 1. *de Maj.* fol. 211. *Review of the Council of* Trent, *p.* 114.

(6.) The sixth and last Inquiry is, Whether that can be a true Church, that persecutes them to the utmost, yea and upon that very account,

count, because they teach, profess and maintain the holy Doctrine and pure Worship, which was left by our blessed Lord and his Apostles, in the holy Scriptures? And this is not an accidental thing, falling out now and then when cruel ones sit in power, for 'tis by Principle: To go no higher than *Trent*, what great points of Primitive Christianity are smitten with terrible *Anathema's*? Nay, what smaller differences are made obnoxious to the same indignation? as to say Marriage is no Sacrament, and that it does not conferr Grace; or to say the Church cannot dispense with the degrees of Consanguinity, or Affinity in *Leviticus*; or to say that Matrimonial Causes belong not to Ecclesiastical Judges, *&c.* or if we enquire all the Causes that state men guilty of Heresie; what guilt would millions be involved in at that Tribunal? To deny the Supremacy of *Rome*, is absolute Heresie; and *Pius* the second has determined it to be Treason and Heresie to appeal to a future Council. In what a case stands the *Gallican* Church? Now in these and all other points they will be Judges in their own Cause; though sometimes they have asserted, That what touches all, ought to be approved by all, and *Nicholas* 1. and *Cælestine* 3. profes'd, that even Reason it self teaches, that our Enemies must not be our Judges; and the Canon-Law expressely, That the Pope himself must not judge in his own Cause: Yet they proceeded at *Trent*, though the Clergy of several Provinces were absent, and some Christian Princes disavowed it. Now what becomes of persons thus determined against and excommunicated? why the Canon-Law dispatches the matter speedily: *Non arbitramur*, &c. We do not esteem them for Murderers, who burning with zeal of the Catholick Mother-Church, should happen to kill any that are excommunicated; and besides, Hereticks are reckoned in so black a Catalogue, that Faith is not to be kept with them; and although *Molanus* and others seem to differ, that's but a private Opinion, they but plow upon the Ocean, and write upon the Sea-sands, so long as it stands in force in the Canon-Law. *Absolutos se noverint*, &c. Let them know that they are absolved from the Obligation of Fealty, Homage and all Duty, whoever were held bound by any Covenant, strengthened by whatsoever band, to such as are manifestly lapsed into Heresie: and the Council of *Constance* hath defined, That the safe conduct of Princes granted to such, ought to be no barre to Ecclesiastical Procedures; *Quocunque vinculo se astrinxerint*; By whatever Band they have obliged themselves. And then let's observe a ruled Case laid down in the same Canon-Law: *Frustrà sibi fidem quis postulat*, &c. In vain does any man require Faith to be kept to himself by him, to whom he refuseth to keep the Faith plighted by himself. Now what brave work would these things make in the world, since all the Reformed Churches lie prostrate under the Thunderbolts of the *Roman* Capitol? First censured for Hereticks, and then no punishment is severe enough: What will become of Christian or of Humane Society, if any Church differ from their Sentiments? And what sad Havock has been made in the Earth, the

Concil. Trident. Sess. 24. Can. 1, 2, 12.

Dist. 22. c. 1. omnes.

Pii 2. Commentar. p. 92. Franc. 1614.

Reg. Juris, 29.

Caus. 16. q. 6. c. 1. gloss.

Caus. 23. q. 5. col. 1791.

Decretal. l. 5. Tit. 7 c. 16. col. 1686.

Concil. Constant. Sess. 19. t. 523. b.

Reg. Jur. 75. col. 850

Bulla Cœnæ per Sixt. 5.

the red lines in the Annals and Martyrologies of most Churches, doe abundantly testifie; even for such things as are consonant to the holy Scriptures. How unmanly and brutish, to use Blowes instead of Reasons! yea, how deviliſh, to persecute men for keeping the Commandments of God! They are of the seed of the *red Dragon*, *Rev.* 12. 17. How vain, to think to conquer mens spirits by Croziers turn'd into Swords, and Keyes into Guns! Persecution indeed may turn some, but 'tis into Hypocrites; that man's never gain'd, but exasperated. That's a declining Cause that can't support it self by the same means by which it was at first propagated. Did the Apostles so, whose lines ran to the ends of the Earth, and conquered so great a part of the *Roman* World to Christ by the Sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God? Good *Bernard* said once to *Eugenius*, what do you use a Sword for, you are commanded to sheath it, (as *Peter*) do the work of an Evangelist, and feed the Sheep? Our Lord did not bid *Peter* feed his Sheep with Iron and Steel, or his Lambs with twisted Wire; though *Baronius* said, *Peter*'s Ministery hath two parts, *To feed, and to kill. Hist. of the Quarrels of Venice*, p. 65. That Pastor shews weakness in Policy, that takes wayes to increase dissenters; as *Polydore* could observe, that the Churches troubles under *Pagan* Emperonrs, so increased the numbers of Believers, that they were at length more suspected for their Multitudes, than their Religion. The more *Israel* was afflicted in *Egypt*, the more they multiplyed and grew, *Exod.* 1. 12. *Rome* never lost ground so fast, as since they used the silly Engine of Persecution to gain it. Mankind is not devoid of Humanity, and Christianity has Nobler Maxims than *Phalaris*; such as flow from that Prince of Might, Elect, who bids the world learn of him, *for he is meek and lowly*; who rebuked the Apostles for desiring that fire might descend upon the *Samaritans*, Luk. 9. 54. and so is his blessed Church a flight of Doves, and a flock of Sheep, who by the generous power of the Spirit of God in Conversion, doe *Ponere id bruti*, lay down the brutish Tyger at the foot of the Prince of Peace, and, of ferocious and savage by Nature, become mild, meek and peaceable, forgiving and forbearing one another, because God for Christs sake hath forgiven them.

Eph. 6.

Bern. de Consid. ad Eugen. l. 1. c. 8.

Polydor. Virg. l. 4. c. 11.

Psal. 45. 3.

Eph. 4. 32. Col. 3. 12, 13.

But how unhappy are they that leave the Posts of Wisdom, and take Sanctuary at the Gates of Hell, and adde this Note, (besides Purity of Doctrine, VVorship and Discipline) whereby the Church may be known, *Viz.* Its perilous and troublesome state, and shew to be of the world: As our Lord foretold, *In the World ye shall have tribulation, but in me ye shall have peace.* VVhere Hawks and VVolves do haunt, there's Dove-coats or Flocks of Sheep neer. So that if any ask, Where our Church was of old? Reply, VVhere Persecutions tryed their Faith. They know well enough where it was, they need not ask us: 'Tis but reading their own Records, their *Rubricæ*, their Scarlet Registers, and they'l easily discern, by the Scriptural points for which holy men suffered, a sufficient mark and evidence of the true Church.

Joh. 16.

Let's

Let's then briefly recapitulate and conclude, That since there are to be found such as in fundamental Doctrines determine contrary to Christ and the blessed Apostles, such as by Idolatry have broken Covenant with God, and give even the VVorship of *Latria* to Creatures, due to him alone; can such without Repentance and Reformation enter into the Kingdom of Heaven? such as form a VVorship to God out of their own Inventions and Novelties, such as contradict themselves in very material and important matters of Salvation; such as blasphemously derogate from the Glory and Honour of Jesus Christ; such as persecute them who profess and endeavour to follow onely the Apostolical Rules, and the consonant practice of the primitive Churches? Though they may pretend to a Unity and Uniformity, yet does it not result into a League and Conspiracy against the Truth? The Ship of the Church is in danger to split against such a Rock as this: Can we judge such Societies and Communions to be true Churches of Christ; and not rather consent with the Determination of the Church of *England*, to the contrary? 2d *part*, *Homil.* for *Whit-Sunday*.

1 Cor. 6. 9. Rev. 14. 10, 11. 21. 8. 22. 15.

If *Charles* the Great, *Alcuinus*, *Agobardus*, *Bertram*, *Bernard*, Abbot *Joachim*, *Peter de Vinets*, *Marsilius*, *Dantes*, *Bradwardin*, *Petrarch*, *Mantuan*, *Gerson*, *Clemongis*, *Theodoricus de Nyem.* and the compiler of *Fasciculus rerum expetendarum*, and many others down along the darker times, might bring in their suffrages in various points; It might be justly feared, that the late Abbot *Gualdi* would be acquitted from rashness in concluding that, "Amongst all the Churches since the Beginning of the "World, there has not been found that unconstancy and confusion as in "the Church of *Rome*, so many Antipopes, Schismes, Heresies, Contro- "versies, Confusions, Suspensions, Persecutions, so many false Opinions, "Scandals, Tyrannies, and intestine Quarrels, as there. But we will rather turn these complaints into unfaigned prayer for their Salvation, and wish them no more hurt than to our own Souls, that the great God would give them Repentance to the acknowledging of the Truth.

Hist. of Cardinals, p. 39.

2 Tim. 2. 25.

3 *Corollary.* III. Since those are true marks of the Church of God, which the Church of *England* hath exhibited, and have been in some measure insisted upon; we may conclude, that *the people of God* in *Britain* (blessed be his holy Name) are in the happy possession of the true Apostolical Doctrine and Worship, according to the holy Scriptures, and consonant to what the true Church of God hath held in all Ages, since the Lord Jesus, the Apostle and High-priest of our Profession, hath left this Heavenly Commission of the Father with his Church.

Heb. 3. 1.

It were no difficult task (onely of labour) to shew out of our own Monuments and Antiquities, and from the VVritings and Records of several Ancients and Moderns, that *Britain* was not converted by such as came from *Rome*, but by others that came hither in the Reign of *Tiberius*, and such as attended *Joseph* of *Arimathea* sent out of *Gaul* by *Philip*. 1. That *Philip* preach'd the Gospel in *Gaul*, *Isidorus*, and our ancient

Isidorus de Sanctis l. 1. Orthodox pat. Vol. 1. p. 598.

ancient *Nennius*, and *Freculfus*, do atteſt. That *Joſeph* of *Arimathea* came into *Britain* to preach the Goſpel, is exceeding probable; unleſs to ſuch whom no ancient Teſtimonies, Records or Traditions doe favour or reliſh, but ſuch as gratifie their own private Fancies and Deſigns: Yea, ſeveral agree that he came at the inſtance and by the direction of *Philip*. If the Charters and Muniments ſet forth in *Monaſticon Anglicanum*; if the Charter of *Henry* the 2d, granted to the Abby of *Glaſtenbury*, which our Annaliſt *John Stow* ſayes he both ſaw and read, and Sir *John Price*, in his Defence of the *Hiſtory of Britain* recites (*verbatim*) in part; wherein our King declares the ſeveral Grants of his *Britiſh* and *Saxon* Anceſtors, which (ſayes he) *Diligenter feci inquiri, & coram me præſentari & legi:* I cauſed to be diligently ſearched out, to be preſented and read before me; where the very Deeds of K. *Arthur*, and *Kenwa'ch* a Pagan Prince, are mentioned, and in ſome of them that place is called the *Mother of Saints*, the *Grave of the Saints*, and that it was firſt built by the very diſciples of Chriſt themſelves: If theſe be not enough, let *Capgrave* ſpeak, mentioning the Acts of *Arthur* and *Melkin* of *Avalon*, or *Glaſtenbury*, who lived before *Merlin*, an Author not utterly to be contemned, eſpecially by ſome, as having reſcued ſeveral Memorials from the Grave of Oblivion: Let *Baleus* teſtifie, delivering many things from *Leland*, one employed by King *Henry* 8. in ſearching the Antiquities of *Britain*, and out of *Fleming*, *Scroop*, and others; yea *Leland* himſelf, in his aſſertion of King *Arthur*: Not to mention ſuch as have been of later date, as *Polydor Virgil*, and *Harding*, *Pitſeus*, &c. According to theſe it appears, that what work *Joſeph* performed in *Britain*, was by the Recommendation of *Philip* out of *Gaul*, and not from *Italy*. But yet we may aſcend higher, and ſhew, that the ſeeds of Chriſtian Religion were firſt ſown in this Iſland 26 years earlier, *ſc.* in the latter end of the Reign of *Tiberius*: For thus writes our ancient *Gildas*, [both of *Polydors* Edition, and *Joſſelins*,] *Tempore, ut ſcimus, Summo Tiberii Ceſaris*, &c. *radios ſuos primum indulget*, i.e. *ſua præcepta Chriſtus:* "Chriſt firſt indulgeth his Rayes, *i. e.* his Pre-"cepts, in the latter end of *Tiberius Cæſar*, as we know.] This teſtimony of *Gildas Badonicus* is alſo confirmed by *Gildas Albanius*, in his Tract of the Victory of *Aurelius Ambroſe*, as ſome relate; but however, let's take the former *Gildas* his time, whereof, though ſome of ours have in ſome meaſure debated, yet let us a little further examine it. The laſt year of *Tiberius* fell in *An. Chr.* 37. as *Petavius* one of their exacteſt Chronologers ſtates it; who brings *Peter* firſt to *Rome A.* 42. and ſets him in the Chair *An.* 43. But the *Britains* receiv'd the Goſpel five years before his coming to *Rome*, and that while *Peter* was yet (in the Year 37.) at *Joppa*. But if *Baronius* his account be true, (who has but a ſmall Faculty at Chronology, or Aſtronomical Calculations, eſpecially of Eclipſes, ſo neceſſary to an Annaliſt, beſides the truth of his allegation;) he brings *Peter* to *Rome*, *An.* 44. but ſettles his Epiſcopal

Bal. de Script. fol. p. 15. *Freculf.* Tom. 2. l. 2. c. 4. p. 448.

Monaſt. Angl. Vol. 1. p. 13. &c.

Stow Annals p. 37.

Price in defence hiſt. Brit. p. 111.

Uſſer primord. p. 327. 719.

Spelman Concil. Tom. 1. appar. p. 12.

Stow, p. 37. & *Selden* polyolb. p. 54.

Capgrave de Joſeph Ar. f. 197. *a. b.*

Bal. p. 15. Baſ. 1559 fol.

Leland Aſſert. Arth. M.S. *Harding*, f. 40, 41. Anno 63.

Polydor p. 52. *Pitſeus* p. 12.

Gildas ex edit. Polydor. p. 10. 1525 & edit. Joan. Joſſelin, p. 9. b. 1568.

Fox Martyrol. Vol. 1. p. 137.

Dr. *Maſon*, p. 51. *Biſhop* of Cov. grand impoſt. p. 35.

Petav. de doct. temp. l. 11. c. 8. p. 304.

Act. 9. 10.

Baron. Annal. A. 44. n. 11, 25.

Id. ad Ann. 44. n. 38. & A. 45. n. 1.

Chair there, *An.* 45. If this be true, the *Britains* receiving the Gospel *An.* 37. must then anticipate *Peters* coming to *Rome*, seven years, and erecting his Seat, and ordering a Church there, eight years. Again, *Marianus Scotus* brings him to *Rome*, *An.* 47. and then *Britains* Conversion antedates theirs by ten years. But all this and much more that might be urged, lies upon the Supposition of *Peters* being there at all, which many of the Learned greatly question. For *Marsilius* of *Padua* argues, that *Peter* was not there, and that *Paul* was the first Bishop of *Rome*. But these things impeach not our Cause at all, forasmuch as all the Apostles had the same Commission with parity of Honour and Power.

Marian Scotus, p. 367.

Marsil. defen. pacis, p. 107.

Id. ib.

If then the *British* Church were planted before ever *Peter* came to *Rome*, let's call to mind that ancient Rule, *Omnes Ecclesiæ huic subjectæ manent à quo institutæ sunt:* All Churches remain subject to him, (*i. e.* in his Successors) by whom they were instituted. And this is not so much a private, as a publick Sanction of the general Council of *Ephesus*, in the case of the *Cypriots*; who having received the Faith from *Barnabas*, yet were much molested by the Bishops of *Antioch*: Concerning whom the *Ephesine* Fathers made a Decree, and extended it to all Churches: *Nullus Episcoporum*, &c. *aliam Provinciam quæ non antea & ab initio fuit sua, sub suam*, &c. *manum trahat:* "Let no Bishop "bring under his power another Province, which was not his before, and "from the beginning.] This is yet more insisted upon by *Zonaras*, in his Comment upon the 8th Canon of that Council, and by *Balsamon* in his *Scholea*; and what is there spoken of *Cyprus*, some have applyed also to *Creet* upon the same ground: but it's not time to discuss that, or of other Provinces. Suffice this Canon to our case; That since *Britain* received the first glorious Light of true Faith from other Disciples of our Lord, and not from *Peter*, and was converted some years before ever the common Tradition of *Peters* coming to *Rome* can be cleared: This Rule totally exempts us from all Jurisdiction pretended by them; since we are (upon these grounds) evidently reducible to some of the *Asian* or *Greek* Churches, in respect to the ancient Rites of Worship, concording with theirs, and oppugnant to *Rome*. This was the Quarrel between the *British* Bishops, and *Austin* the Monk, as Venerable *Bede* relates, *in multis*, in many things, but especially in the celebration of *Easter*, and Ministration of Baptism. This troubled the North *British* Churches; about which very thing the Synod at *Whitby* was called, *An.* 664. and there *Hilda* and her associates averred their customs from *John*, *Philip*, *Polycarp*, &c. of the Eastern Communion. Neither were these matters wholly silenced as to the *Welsh* *Britains*, till the year 762. More might be said also about *Lucius* and *Ethelberts* times, that the last especially was but an attempt to yoke the *British* Churches under the Dominion of *Rome*, which they stoutly resisted. And it might be evidenced, that Christian Religion was initiated among the *Saxons* before

Acta Concil. Ephesin. Tom. 2. App. cap. 4. p. 201. Edit. Petan.

Concil Ephesin Zonaræ, p. 85. Edit. Par. 1618.

Balsam. in Synd. Ephes. Can. 8. p. 319. Paris, 1620.

Corol. a S. Paulo p. 18.

Bed. l. 2. c. 2. p. 112.

Baleus, f. 81. Spelm. Concil. p.

Lloyds Brev. of Brittain. fol. 57. b.

Austin

Austin the Monk arrived. For Queen *Bertha* enjoyed the Benefit of Christian Worship, by the Ministry of *Luidhardus* a Bishop, sent with her out of *France*, and it was celebrated in a *British* Church dedicated to S. *Martin*, in the East-side of the City of *Canterbury*, and built in the time of the *Romans*, as some others were which *Austin* had leave to repair. Beda l. 1. c. 26. Ibid. c. 26.

But say, 1. We received our Light first from *Rome*, (which is false;) and grant, 2. The Dominion of *Peter* to be Universal; and yield, 3. The Bishop of *Rome* to be his undoubted Successor; and that, 4. There are no flawes in the Old Chair; and that, 5. This Bishop is invested by Christ with all the Priviledges of an Apostle; which are all precarious and begg'd: Yet, if they apostatize from the Doctrine and Faith of *Peter*, must all other Churches be censured for separating from them who separate from Christ, from *Peter* and from *Paul*? We profess to hold unfeignedly with Old *Rome*, whatever it held according to *Pauls* Epistle to the *Romans*, nay and with the Church in *Babylon*, (possibly neer *Memphis*,) in whatever they retained of *Peters* Doctrine: When they are return'd to *Peter* and *Paul*'s Doctrine, *&c.* then let them treat with us; but else, if any depart, that old Maxim should be refresh'd, *Causa, non Separatio Schismaticum facit:* 'Tis not Separation, but the Cause that determines Schisme. They are *Schismaticks* that depart from *Peter*, *Constit. Apostol. l. 6. c.* 4. And another not to be forgotten; [*Dum Ecclesia habet Pastorem Hæreticum vel Schismaticum, vacare intelligitur:*] While a Church hath a Heretick or Sciſmatick for its Pastor, it's to be counted Vacant.] In which case what shall be said to their own *Genebrard*, who affirms, That Fifty Popes in Succession, for almost one hundred and fifty years together, were either *Apostactici, vel Apostatici, potius quam Apostolici:* Irregular or Apostates, rather than Apostolical. Pope *Marcellinus* said, He could not see how they could be saved, who were advanced to the Papacy, *Onuphr. in vit. Marcell.* I shall not here enlarge upon any of their irregular Intrusions into the Throne, the Fighting and Blood-shed (mentioned by *Ammianus*) at the Election of *Damasus*, nor their personal Vices and Heresies, nor the Insession of the Chair by that Learned Dame, unkindly mentioned by *Laonicus*, and uncomfortably revived in our Church-Homilies: When these points are duely and seriously weighed, what cause the Reformed have had for a Secession and departure from them, to the Glory of God, to the Reverence of *Peters* Doctrine, to the Comfort and Peace of our Consciences; let the *Greek* Churches, or any other that maintain Scripture-Doctrine and Worship, nay, let all in other parts of the World that own the true God, be Judges.

1 Pet. 5. 13. ἐν Βαβυλῶνι. Decretal Greg. 9. l. 5. Tit. 7. f. 285 Par. *Genebrard* Chron. l. 4. Ann. 904. p. 817. *Amian.* l. 27. *Laonicus* Chalcocondyl. de rebus Turc. l. 6. p. 200. Ed. Col. Allobr. 1615. 2d. part of the Serm. for Whitsunday, f. 232. 2.

But to draw to an end: How greatly ought we to resound his Praises, who hath in all Ages, through the depth of the darkest times, conserved the true Faith and Doctrine all along, and of his great Mercy conveyed to us authentick Testimonies and Evidences, notwithstanding the Bar-

barisin and Violence of several Ages against the Truth. Nay, it might be shewn, that God hath not left us without a Lamp of Testimony to the most material Points, even here in *Britain*; but that it would arise to a little Chronicle, not proper for this Place and Time, but obvious to be observed, in the several Hints and Reflections upon what they called Errours, in several publick Synods in this Island, even till the time of *Wickliff*, when the Truth broke out more gloriously, and still shineth in great Lustre, blessed be his most holy Name.

4 Corollary. IV. Hath Almighty God, of his infinite goodness, so graciously hitherto preserved his Church, and bestowed upon the Reformed Countreys his most holy Bible, translated with great care and diligence out of the Sacred Originals into our Mother-tongues, and poured out that Grace to endeavour to Reform, according to his Heavenly Directions therein recorded; *let us give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time we should let them slip*, and *hold fast* that which we have received from Heaven, that *no man take away our Crown.* Let's take heed of Wantonness, of resisting or abusing the blessed Gospel, or any way walking unworthy of it, lest God provoked by our Unholiness, should remove the Golden Candlestick into Corners, or to other Nations. Let's take great heed of creeping corruptions, and of those Communions that erre in Faith, departing from the Head, from the Scriptures, from the Doctrine of the Apostles, from Purity of Worship, lest if we partake of their Sins, we be involved also in their Plagues. *Come out of her, my people*, sayes the Lord; and having been obedient to the Heavenly Vision, let us keep our Garments unspotted, that men see not our shame, as we love the Salvation of our Souls, and the Glory of the Son of the Living God, the onely true Basis and Rock of his Church. Let's heartily pity, and earnestly pray for such as are yet Judicially hardened to believe a Lye.

Heb. 2. 1.

Rev. 3. 11.

Rev. 18. 4.

Rev. 16. 15. 2 Thes. 2. 10, 11.

5 Corollary. V. Since our blessed Lord hath built his Church upon *himself*, who is a *Rock flowing with Milk and Honey*, then all true Believers being fixed upon this amiable and lovely Foundation *laid in Zion*, should sweetly unite in holy Love together, *being rooted and built up together in him.* Let not these living Marbles, polisht for *Solomon*'s Palace, dash against one another. Let not the Sheep of Christ push each other.

Col. 2. 7.

Quis teneros mihi fascinat agnos?

Who hath bewitched you, O foolish *Galatians?* These unnatural buttings (as Shepherds observe) presage very stormy dayes. Shall Roses that grow in *Sharon*, gash each others tender sides, and the Churches Vines turn Brambles? When some Troops in an Army fight not against the Enemy, but give fire at their own Regiments, is it not a notorious sign of Infatuation, or Conspiracy against their Native Prince? Shall a few Externals engage spirits in mutual heats and conflicts, to the laughter, scorn, and hope of the Adversary; who will joyn with one part for a while, that they may devour both at last, and blow up those intestine heats

heats into a flame, at which they'l joyfully warm their hands? Mildness and Meekness is the Glory of a Christian; and the way to gain Brethren to our Opinions, is by ponderous Arguments and sweet Affections. Naturalists observe, that Fish will never be taken by a bloody Net; and when Sheep bring forth Lions, 'tis portentuous of Tyranny. It's utterly impossible in our lapsed Estate, to make all of a Mind, and a most improper Means, to propagate Opinions by Violence. *Socrates* treating of the Diversities about *Easter*, and other Rites, in an excellent Chapter tending to Christian Union, sayes, ὡδέποτε περὶς ἑαυτὲς διεφώνησαν. That they by no means dissociated from one another, and that those who consent in the same Faith, may differ in Rites and Ceremonies, and that the Apostles gave no Precepts about such matters, but left all to their free liberty; and again, bewails such as in his time counted Whoredom indifferent, but strove for such Feasts as for their Lives. Neither may we forget those golden sayings of blessed *Austin*: [*Interminabilis est ista contentio generans lites, non finiens quæstiones: sit ergo una fides*, &c. *etiamsi ipsa fidei unitas quibusdam diversis Observationibus celebratur, quibus nullo modo quod in fide verum est, impeditur*: "This Contention is "endless, gendring to strife, not putting an end to Questions: let the Faith "therefore be one, *&c.* although the Unity of Faith be celebrated with "certain diverse Rites, by which that which is true in the Faith, is no "wayes hindred.] All the Glory of the Queen is within; those outward Rites are only the Embroydery of her Garments, which may be of various Colours. The Dove of the Church may have her *Wings covered with Silver, and her Feathers with yellow Gold.* The same Army may have diversity of Banners, and yet fight unanimously and victoriously under one and the same General. We agree in the main, *and whereto we have already attained, let's walk by the same Rule*, and *mind the same thing*, and if any be otherwise minded, God may in time reveal even that unto them. There will never be Peace in the Christian World, so long as scrupulous Externals are by proud and foolish persons press'd with equal rigour to many Substantials and Fundamentals.

Socrat. Eccl. hist. l. 5. c. 21.
p. 695.
p. 697.
p. 699.
Ælian.
August. Ep. 86, p. 388.
Psal. 45.
Psal. 68. 13.
Phil. 3. 15, 16.
Gal. 6. 16.

So far are some pious Spirits from this fiery temper, that they are not without hope of several in farre different Communions: But if any among ours speak or write more mildly, favourably and softly, of some of theirs, 'tis not to be understood of such as finally persist in the high and fundamental points of difference; but of them that privately whisper and sigh among their Friends; *Sic dicerem in Scholis, sed tamen (maneat inter nos) diversum sentio*, &c. *non potest probari de sacris literis*, &c. "So I speak in the Schools, but yet (let that be kept private) I think "otherwise, and that it cannot be proved out of Holy Scriptures. Of such as sincerely cry out with the Cardinal, *Tutissimum est fiduciam totam in solâ Dei misericordiâ & benignitate reponere. It's safest to cast all our Confidence on the Mercy and Benignity of God only:* To adhere to the precious Blood of Christ alone, without Works. There be some

Ursperg. paræn. ep. p. 343. Edit. 1609.
Bell. de justif. Tom. 4. l. 5. c. 7. p. 276. Col. Agr. 1628.

some even in *Babylon* of his People, to be called out in the Day of Vengeance, *Rev.* 18. 4. Such as are in heart ours, and as to the Cardinal Point of Justification, dye in the Reformed Religion; such as *Pighius* (though otherwise bitter,) as *Vergerius*, *Gerson*, *Ferus*, *Jansenius*, and Father *Paul* the *Venetian*, and many others.

Osiand. Cent. 16. p. 501.

6 *Corallary.* VI. In the sixt and last place. All the true living Members of the holy Church of Christ, may be greatly comforted from this Text and Doctrine; for though the Church will never be fully quiet and at rest, while the Gates of Hell stand undemolisht, but will be still exposed to furious Assaults, to boysterous waves, tempestuous storms, direfull persecutions, and secret undermining Heresies, to their *Molimina* and *Blandimenta*: Sometimes to fierce Oppositions and flattering Inticements, and sometimes to both together, yet herein stands the Faith and Patience of the Saints. Therefore all gracious Christians must be content, and resolved to exercise themselves in this spiritual Warfare, and by fervent Prayer call down Auxiliary help from Heaven, whereby the invincible and omnipotent God is humbly implored, and Legions of holy Angels sent in for assistance. Yet,

Rev. 13. 10. 14. 12.

(1) Let holy Souls be comforted in this, that *no Weapon formed against Mount Zion shall* finally *prosper. The Virgin Daughter of Zion hath despised them, and laughed them to scorn, the Daughter of Jerusalem hath shaken her head at them.* For as the Golden-mouth'd Preacher expresses it, Τὴν Βελοσπήκλω αὐτῦ ἐξεκένωσεν ὁ διάβολος, τὴν δὲ ἐκκλησίαν ἐκ ἔβλαψε *Satan hath emptied his quiver, but hath not hurt the Church.* By how much the more the Enemies rage against her, by so much the more the true Professors of Piety and Faith increase: Not unlike the Vine, that growes the more fertile by pruning, or as the Palm, that rises the more erect after weights and pressures; and although in time of trouble, like some Plants that shut up their Flowers upon a storm, yet afterward display their lively and lovely colours more Orientely to the face of the shining Sun. The Church of God, though she be not alwayes so openly visible, as that all the World shall cry *Hosanna* to her splendor and glory, yet she growes more numerous, holy and stable, by her troubles: Her Enemies may seem for a time ἰσχύειν, *valere*, but shall not καθισχύειν, *prævalere*, as 'tis promis'd in the Text; to be *potent* and strong, but shall never subdue and vanquish her. They might believe Christ, and spare their trouble. They may *vires exerere*, put forth their utmost power, but the Gates of Hell, (ἅδης, *portæ Mortis*,) of Death and the Grave, shall never attain to, or compass so deadly a stroke, as shall extirpate the Church in any Age. Nay, the Wisdom of God hath ever turned their Policies into Folly, and their Puissance into Cowardice. They have often been forced to suck up the Cockatrice-Egges that they have laid, and felt the keenness of their own recoiling Arrowes. They may open, but shall never be able to swallow the Church: They may cast out floods, but shall never drown her; as he said of ancient *Rome*, *Mersa profundo*, *pulchrior*

Isa. 54. 17. 37. 22.

Chrysost. Serm. 1. *in Penticost.* *Tom.* 5 p. 979. *Ed. Æton.*

Rev. 12. 15. 16.

pulchrior evenit: Cast her in the Sea, she dives, and rises again with her face washt from spots, and looks more beautifull. The Church may be press'd for a while, but suppress'd never. The Archers may *shoot sorely at her, but her bow shall abide in strength.* God will have a Church to endure to the Worlds end, in spight of all the privy Leagues and Confederacies that are contrived in, or all the Forces and Powers that issue from the Gates of Hell. *Her place of defence shall be the Munition of Rocks*; and *all the Nations that fight against Ariel shall be as the dream of a Night Vision.* Isa. 33. 16. Isa. 29. 7.

(2) The Church after all Assaults and Conflicts, in fine, shall be compleatly victorious and triumphant; she will joyfully survive her Enemies, and behold their Funerals. Let holy Souls rely upon this promise in the Text, and improve it in Prayer for their comfort and sustentation; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it. *The Nations shall see it and be confounded at all their might, &c. They shall lick the dust like a serpent, and move out of their holes like worms of the earth: they shall be afraid of the Lord our God, and fear because of him.* There is a time, and it hastens, that this Rock shall dash them in pieces, and *they shall become like the chaffe of the Summer-threshing-floores, and the wind shall carry them away*, and no place be found for them. There is a glorious time a coming, (*rumpantur ut ilia Romæ,*) when the Stones of this Temple shall be *laid with fair colours, and her Foundations with Saphirs, her Windowes with Agates, her Gates with Carbuncles, and all her Borders with pleasant Stones*; when the false Rock of the pretended *Peter* shall like a Milstone be flung into the depth of the Sea, and her gaudy Ædifice shall melt into foam, and be dissipated among the Waters. Then shall one of their own Prophecies (I mean of the *Irish Malachy*,) be surely fulfilled; *Civitas sepcticollis diruetur, & Judex tremendus judicabit populum suum:* "The seven-hilled City shall be ruined, and the terrible "Judge shall judge his People. Or rather that of *Obadiah*: *Saviours shall come upon Mount Zion, to judge the Mount of Esau, and the Kingdom shall be the Lords.* Mich. 7. 16. Isa. 54. 11. *Messingham Florileg. Hiberniæ. p.* 378. Obad. v. 21.

(3) In the mean time, let the Church of God be comforted also in this, that the *bread of support* shall be given her, and the *water of consolation* shall be sure. Out of this Rock of Ages flowes a *River of living waters, the streams whereof shall make glad the City of God.* Nay, *with Honey out of the Rock shall they be satisfied*, while wandring in the Wilderness toward *Canaan*, and at last transported to the City of the *New Jerusalem*, which is above, where there's *fulness of joy*, and *pleasures for evermore*; where they shall be abundantly satisfied with the *Fatness* of that Heavenly Temple, and shall drink in the Rivers of the Cœlestial *Eden.* Isa. 33. 16. Psal. 46. 4. 81. 16. Psal. 16. 11. Psal. 36. 8. עֶדְנֶיךָ *Edenis tuæ.*

FINIS.